NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

No. DCXXIX.

APRIL, 1908.

THE SPIRIT AND LETTER OF EXCLUSION.

BY OSCAR S. STRAUS, SECRETARY OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.

THE question of immigration has been of great importance to the United States since the beginning of our history. It has changed materially in many respects with the growth and development of the country, but with the changes that have taken place the question itself has steadily increased in vital importance. In the beginning, we depended wholly upon the migrations from older nations of the world to this continent; but even then the migrations differed essentially from the migrations of earlier ages. The latter were due to different causes, and were for different purposes from those which impelled the migrations to our part of the continent. Formerly migrations were *en masse,* not individualistic. They were undertaken for the benefit of the state from which the migrants came. In all considerations of the question as it pertains to the United States, a clear line of distinction must be drawn between that form of migration and this, which is individualistic.

Up to the close of the Civil War all of our laws upon this subject were framed with a view to encouraging immigration. From that time on, legislation was directed toward the elimination of undesirable immigration. First, it pertained principally to criminals and paupers, who did not come to us of their own

Copyright, 1908, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All Rights Reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

volition, but because their governments desired to be rid of them. Later, the laws which have been passed on the subject, while in no way hostile to immigration as such, have proceeded upon the general policy of selection, thereby excluding more and more individuals coming under the general designation of "undesirable classes."

The profound importance of the subject as a whole appears in the fact that the total number of aliens admitted during the past year was 1,285,349, which exceeded that of the fiscal year of 1906 by 184,614, and that of the fiscal year of 1905 by 258,850. The external impelling causes are, generally, religious oppression and economic pressure. The internal causes are commercial prosperity and the opportunities and advantages that are afforded for better conditions in our free, democratic country; so that our immigration, at large, is really an index of our prosperity.

The legislative regulation of immigration also presents an increasingly complex problem as the jurisdiction of the United States expands. It would be relatively simple if the nation were small and compact, with industrial operations so generally alike as to be susceptible of a uniform system. But the industries and occupations of the people of the United States are greatly diversified and are carried on under widely varying conditions. Moreover, instead of being confined to a single, contracted area, the jurisdiction of the nation extends to such distant and far-separated possessions as Alaska, Panama, Porto Rico, Hawaii, Guam and the Philippines.

These outlying possessions not only differ from the body of the continental territory as to their position and needs with regard to labor and immigration, but they differ likewise among themselves. A particular policy of restriction, in the matter of immigration, expressly designed to meet the situation on the mainland, cannot be perfectly adapted to the needs of insular communities, each of which has its own industrial problems to solve.

The need of differentiation in the regulation of immigration was brought home to me with great force during the past summer, when, besides actually viewing the administration of immigration laws along the borders of Canada and on the Pacific coast, I personally visited the Hawaiian Islands, and saw for myself something of the effect of these laws upon the occupations of the people. As the result of this experience and of the best consid-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eration I have been able to give the subject, I believe that special attention should be directed to the question of immigration into the insular possessions of the United States. The conditions peculiar to these several possessions should be taken into account and provided for.

The significance of the term "Undesirable Classes," when applied to immigrants with a view to elimination by exclusion, may differ materially according to the needs of the locality in question. In the East, the main objection to the greatly increased immigration during the past decade arises from the congestion and consequent evils caused thereby in our large Atlantic seaport cities. In the West, the question of Chinese immigration presents a problem of long standing.

The present policy of the United States toward Chinese immigration has existed for nearly a generation. A governmental policy so long pursued is not to be lightly changed, nor is it the present purpose to suggest any change, so far as the spirit of the policy is concerned. What I would urge is not only based on a full recognition of the fixed character of the present policy, but is entirely in furtherance of it. It is only suggested that the letter of the law, as expressed and enforced to-day, may not be so effectively and harmoniously in accord with the spirit of the policy as it might be. It is not the policy of the Government with reference to Chinese immigration, but the manner in which it is, of necessity, carried out, by reason of the way in which the laws are framed, that causes constant friction and dissatisfaction.

It has been the policy of this Government, as would appear from its laws and treaties, to exclude persons of the Chinese race merely because they are Chinese, regardless of the class to which they belong, and without reference to their age, sex, culture, or occupation, or the object of their coming to this country, or the length of their stay in it. The real purpose of the Government's policy is to exclude a particular and well-defined class, leaving other classes of Chinese—except as they, in common with all other foreigners, may be included within the prohibitions of the general immigration laws—as free to come and go as the citizens or subjects of any other nation.

As the laws are framed, however, it would appear as if the purpose were rigidly to exclude persons of the Chinese race in general, and to admit only such persons of the race as fall within

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

certain expressly stated exemptions. I regard this feature of the present laws as unnecessary and fraught with irritating consequences. In the administration of the laws as framed, no matter what care is taken to treat with courtesy and consideration persons of the Chinese race who are lawfully entitled to admission, it is impossible that those who have to endure the formalities required of them should fail to take offence and to resent as a humiliation the manner in which by law they are distinguished from natives of other countries. Laws so framed can only be regarded as involving a discrimination on account of race, though discriminations on account of race, color, previous condition or religion, are alike opposed to the principles of the Republic and to the spirit of its institutions.

It is not surprising, therefore, that both the Chinese Government and the Chinese people should feel aggrieved, and should in various ways manifest their resentment and their displeasure. The attitude of the Chinese Government may be inferred from the fact that in 1904, after the convention of 1894 had been in force ten years, China availed herself of her reserved right and formally denounced the treaty, refusing longer to be a party to an arrangement which, as carried into effect, was offensive to her national pride.

The understanding in China, her officials contended, was that the object both of the treaty and of the laws was to exclude laborers; not that the enumeration of certain exempt classes should operate as an exclusion of all other classes and of laborers besides; while the interpretation of our laws on the subject was declared to be not only that those Chinese shall be excluded who are expressly forbidden entrance—namely, laborers—but that only those may be admitted who are expressly allowed.

For proof of the feeling of the Chinese people it is only necessary to refer to the boycott of American goods, inaugurated by various trade guilds and business and commercial associations of the Empire during the summer of 1905. At that time China held first rank among Oriental countries as a consumer of American products. In that year, her total commerce amounted to $497,000,000, of which $329,000,000 were imports; $57,000,000, or more than seventeen per cent., being supplied by the United States. The exports from the United States to China had grown to these proportions by rapid strides. They were less than $3,-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

000,000 in the seventies. They only reached $7,500,000 in 1886, $12,000,000 in 1897, $15,000,000 in 1900, $24,000,000 in 1902, $57,000,000 in 1905. It was reasonable to believe that American trade would continue to progress in something like the same ratio, and a larger and larger share of the foreign trade of China accrue to the United States. Instead of that, the exports of the United States to China, according to our statistics, fell to $44,000,000 in 1906, and to $26,000,000 in 1907.

It is not necessary to attribute the decline wholly to the boycott of 1905, but a drop in our exportations to that country of fifty per cent. in two years is sufficiently startling to challenge attention. But on higher grounds than those of mere commercial interest should the frame of the laws be changed. The relations between China and the United States have always been most friendly. It is not only the right but the duty of this Government, for its own protection and for the security and welfare of its citizens, to exclude foreigners from its territory whenever public interests so require. But to so exercise that right as to needlessly offend the *amour propre* of a friendly nation, or unnecessarily to humiliate a whole people when only a particular class is to be reached, cannot be the action intended.

I would not suggest a change in the established policy of rigidly excluding Chinese laborers of every description, both skilled and unskilled. The policy has been and will continue to be as effectively enforced as circumstances will permit. But, at a time when this policy of exclusion has been so thoroughly applied that there remain in the United States only about 70,000 Chinese—less than one-tenth of one per cent. of our population—little danger need be apprehended from a full and fair reconsideration of the subject and a recasting of the laws upon a juster basis. Indeed, a more opportune moment than the present can hardly be desired for reaching a better understanding with China on the subject of Chinese immigration, and for adjusting the letter to the spirit of our national policy of exclusion.

By making admission the rule, and exclusion the exception, we could easily preserve the present policy in all its integrity, and even strengthen the real prohibitory features thereof, at the same time entirely removing a material cause of friction, dissatisfaction and unnecessary humiliation to the people of a friendly nation.

OSCAR S. STRAUS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE DOGMATIC AUTHORITY OF THE PAPACY.

THE ENCYCLICAL ON MODERNISM.

BY THE MOST REVEREND JOHN IRELAND, ARCHBISHOP OF ST. PAUL.

THE article in the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for last December, from the pen of Mr. Charles Johnston, "The Catholic Reformation and the Papacy," covers much ground, nearly the whole history of the Papacy. Lest I be unreasonably lengthy in my reply, I will confine myself to what I take to be the main point at issue, "the dogmatic despotism of the Papacy," with particular reference to the recent Encyclical on Modernism.

The term "despotism" is too violent to be accepted, without due reservation, even for argument's sake: it is, at first encounter at least, too redolent of arbitrariness and of assumed power to suit my Catholic taste. I should prefer the term "authority," and to say, instead of the dogmatic despotism, the dogmatic authority of the Papacy. But with this remark I let the matter pass.

According to Mr. Johnston the Papacy is wrong when, at any time, it undertakes to be dogmatic, to teach, to impose upon the human intellect dogmas of religion: it is estopped, he maintains, from doing so by the example of Christ and the Apostles, by the fact that Christianity is not a religion of dogmas or creeds, but, instead, a life, a hope, an inspiration. Mr. Johnston adopts as his own the words of the Milanese Review, "*Il Rinnovamento*":

> "Christianity is life: it is unquenchable aspiration; it is hope; it is a striving of the whole being towards that which in life partakes of the eternal. . . . It is in vain that we try to enclose Christianity in intellectual systems and definite expressions of development. . . . And if we deem possible a new Christian civilization it is on one condition: that the spirit of Christ signifies the spirit of liberation, no

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one seeking to confine it to his own theories, hypotheses or systems; but each one feeling it as an imminent command in his heart to uplift his life in all its activities."

Doubtless, if religion is merely "life," dogmas and creeds are doomed: a teacher of positive, objective doctrine is at once ruled out of court. And this, I may be allowed to note, is the popular religion of the day. To-day the cry is: "No dogma, no creed! Only the life of the spirit, the good man following out in daily practice the rulings of conscience." But is this creedless, undogmatic religion the Christian religion? "*Il Rinnovamento,*" again quoted approvingly by Mr. Johnston, continues:

"Where do we find Jesus claiming despotic authority over men's intellects, and demanding that they shall renounce their convictions? . . . Jesus does not say: 'Whoever dares to talk otherwise than I, let him be anathema.' He does say: 'Come unto Me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.' . . . Jesus does not say: 'Whosoever does depart from the orthodox faith, let him die the death.' He does say: 'He that hath My commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth Me.'"

Unhappily for Mr. Johnston and "*Il Rinnovamento,*" and also for the popular religion of the day, what is given as not said by Christ is precisely what Christ did say. The commission to the Apostles was: "Go ye into the whole world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be condemned"; or, as King James's version reads, "shall be damned." The Apostles are bidden to preach, to teach: to their preaching and teaching intellectual assent must be given: where such assent is refused, "anathema" is pronounced, damnation is threatened.

The religion put forth by Christ was a dogmatic religion—a series of facts and principles, to which, under severest penalty, absolute submission of mind must be accorded. Christ was the teacher, the bearer of a message, to which the mind of the hearer was to be set in unison, and, afterwards, under the influence of the mind, the other faculties of the soul. The faith required from disciples was, before all else, an assent of the intellect. "To this end was I born and for this came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth." "If ye continue in My words, then ye are My disciples, and ye shall know the truth." Christ taught His personal rank and dignity, His Mes-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

siahship, His divine sonship, His oneness with the Father: He taught His right to revise and reinterpret the Mosaic Law, His power to forgive sins: He taught the establishment of His Church, the giving of His flesh to eat and of His blood to drink, the coming of the Holy Spirit, the communication of His own mission to the Apostles. We need not now discuss the precise meaning of those several preachings of Christ: but a meaning to them there surely was, and that meaning, such as He intended it, was to be accepted, believed, even though, as in the Sixth Chapter of John, the announcement was "a hard saying," from which the multitude had turned in scorn. The faith Christ called for was belief in His words, submission to His authority as Master and Teacher.

The Apostles knew of none other than a dogmatic religion; they allowed none other to their disciples. Theirs was a religion of faith—of faith that came from hearing: "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ." The purpose of the Apostolic preaching was to destroy "every height that exalted itself against the knowledge of God," and to bring "into captivity every understanding unto the obedience of Christ." What the Apostles taught was the "deposit," a substantial doctrine, no mere aspiration of the soul: it was "the faithful word which is according to doctrine." It was "the sound doctrine" by which the gainsayers were to be convinced; it was "the form of sound words." The disciples were exhorted to walk "confirmed in the faith" as they had "learned it," not cheated "by philosophy or vain deceits," not carried about "by every wind of doctrine." Whenever necessary, they were to be rebuked sharply, "that they may be sound in the faith." Were any one to teach differently from what had been once declared, were he a very angel from heaven, he is accursed. Whoever departs from the faith, "who continueth not in the doctrine of Christ," is to be avoided, not even noticed with a friendly salute. And "the faith" was "once for aye delivered to the saints": it was to be transmitted to others with most sacred care. "Keep the good deposit committed to thy trust," wrote Paul; "O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding the profane novelties of words and oppositions of knowledge falsely so called."

Plainly, the religion preached by the Apostles was a dogmatic religion, having a well-defined creed, a "faithful word," a "form

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of sound words"; and the prime duty imposed upon succeeding Christian teachers was to guard well this "faithful word," this "form of sound words," to hold it unsullied "by vain philosophies and profane novelties of words." What else, we may say, is Pius X doing in his Encyclical but obeying those solemn injunctions? Paul speaks; Pius X follows out his injunctions.

Christ, indeed, was "the life": He came to beget in humanity a new life, arousing it from sinfulness and lethargy, lifting it towards the skies, quickening it into the very life of the Godhead. But before Christ was the life, He was the truth: "I am the way, the truth and the life." He first addresses the intellect, laying before it the principles and truths, through which the heart and the will are to be moved into life and action. Any other course of evangelization were a lowering of human dignity, a treatment of man as if man were merely a creature of sense and emotion: and it were, also, a mere beating of the air, necessarily void of substantial and enduring effect. Of itself, the will is blind: it requires illumination and guidance from the intellect. A mere call to regeneration is sterile sound. There is no real moral elevation that is not based upon principles; there is no life-giving religion that is not endowed with a fertilizing creed.

In teaching a dogmatic religion, Pius X has fullest warrant from Christ and the Apostles. Indeed, did he not teach, did he not raise aloud the cry of alarm when peril is nigh, he would be faithless to his trust, heedless to his commission: "Teach all nations." The hour came to the Papacy when speech was an imperative duty: the Encyclical on Modernism followed.

The Encyclical is not, as some have imagined who judged it from its title without a glance through its contents, a condemnation of the Twentieth Century—of the material and social progress which is the proud boast of the age. Far from this: the Encyclical applauds our material and social achievements. Quoting the words of his predecessor, Pius X writes:

> "Apply yourselves energetically to the study of natural sciences: the brilliant discoveries and the bold and useful applications made of them in our times, which have won such applause from our contemporaries, will be an object of perpetual praise to those that come after us."

Nor in any sense is the Encyclical what Mr. Johnston asserts it to be—a repulse of intellectual life:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"It is both interesting and ominous to find the Vatican seeking thus to stem the tide of intellectual life, and ordering the combating of error even to the shedding of blood."

If Mr. Johnston has in mind the tide of intellectual life outside the region of divine revelation, he may lay down his fears. Divine revelation alone enters into the province of Papal vigilance. Other branches of knowledge the Church leaves to their own methods and their own ambitions. Whenever it is found in contact with them, it is only for the purpose of stimulating them to more fruitful growth: and how beneficial in this regard its co-operation has been history bears ample testimony. True, in the Syllabus of Errors, given out by a Roman Congregation shortly before the appearance of the Encyclical, a condemned proposition reads as follows: "Under no respect does it appertain to the Church to pass judgment concerning the assertions of human sciences." But Mr. Johnston misreads the proposition when he renders it into this general form, "The Church has the right to pass judgment on natural sciences." Upon the rigid, well-ascertained discoveries and conclusions of science the Church passes no judgment; what it arraigns before its tribunal, and with plenary right on its part, are "the assertions" of certain scientists, in contradiction with the teachings of revelation, whose sayings, far from being well-established conclusions, are simply, as the Encyclical calls them, "opinions" and "vagaries."

The Encyclical is a defence of religious truth against certain vital errors that have come into vogue, inside and outside the Catholic Church, in these modern times. Against those errors it declares a relentless war, in which, however, the arms brought into use will be those of reason and of revelation—not those of human blood, as Mr. Johnston has been tempted to imagine. The words that have frightened my esteemed friend—"Even unto the shedding of blood"—were spoken by the Pope during an allocution to a gathering of French bishops, a year or so ago, in the Palace of the Vatican. But the blood which the good Pope called for, in case blood were to be at any time the order of the day in France, was that of the bishops themselves, whom he fain would have imbued with the spirit of martyrdom. It was not in the intention of the Pope, we may be quite sure, to invoke a war of extermination against the enemies of the Church

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

seated in power upon the banks of the Seine, or against heretics and unbelievers elsewhere in the world.

The Encyclical condemns the "New Theology," as it is called in England, where the Protestant R. J. Campbell and the Catholic George Tyrrell have been its leading protagonists. The same theory of religion had found utterance in Continental countries of Europe under varied names—"The Religion of Immanence," "The Religion of Action," "The New Apologetics." Who, specifically, the writers are whose teachings are placed under censure, and to what degree each one has given cause for condemnation, the Pope does not say. It is quite possible that the one or the other may not have held to all the errors now gathered together and mutually interconnected in the Encyclical under the name of Modernism. But that with the one or with the other the errors, as rehearsed, did come to the front, none will deny who has at all kept himself *au courant* with the religious literature of recent times.

The starting-point of Modernism is the assumption that, of itself, human reason is powerless to establish either the existence of God as a transcendent reality, or the divinity of the mission and the person of Christ. With some, the cause of this mental attitude is an adherence to the Kantian system of Philosophy, which teaches that human reason does not reach beyond "phenomena" or appearances of things, that "noumena," or realities back of appearances, totally escape its grasp of vision. With others, it is what they term the weakness and insufficiency of intellectual proofs, available in favor either of natural religion or of Christian revelation. In both cases the conclusion is the same: intellectualism is abandoned as a basis of religion. Another basis must be sought: it is found in the inner sense and experience of the soul, in its cravings for life, in its motives of action. Feeling is substituted for reason: subjective emotion for intellectual assent.

To the new theology, God is unknown and unknowable. On this score it accepts the teachings of Comte, Hamilton and Spencer. But must we, it asks, overlook on this account God as a non-existent being or as one in whom we have no concern, towards whom we have no duties? No conclusion of this kind is allowed. Conscience, the Kantists say, clamors for the Supreme Legislator: therefore He is; therefore we accept Him.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The idea of God is chief among "the values" of life, say the Ritschlians of Germany, the Pragmatists of England and of America: God, as "a value," enters, of necessity, into the thoughts and the movements of the soul, and must therefore be taken as a reality. The throbbings of the heart, the thirstings of the soul, say the apostles of "Immanence" and of "Action," imperiously tend towards the Infinite, who therefore must be and is a reality. Indeed, continue the latter, the deep experiences of the soul are such vivid revelations of God that they must be and are the very voice of God—God "immanent" in us, the source within us of life and of action.

In those several views and theories we may see partial truths, that need by no means be brushed aside, when we are seeking to prove the transcendent reality of the Infinite. Conscience calls for a judge, who ought to be God: the exigencies of the soul clamor for satiety, which can come only from the Infinite. Facts those are that dispose the mind to search for an Almighty Being, transcending the soul of man, transcending the whole external universe, and beforehand prepare us to hold earnestly to Him, when once we have caught a glimpse of His glory. Serviceable they are as a starting-point for argument: but of themselves and in themselves they are not an argument to compel conviction. Emotions and experiences do not reach out into the objective; they do not establish the existence of a reality independent of the human soul. This the intellect alone can do. The radical mistake of Modernism and of its methods of apologetics is that it excludes or, at least, minimizes overmuch the functions of the intellect, thereby unduly reducing its theodicy to sentiment—to mere subjectivism. Against this subjectivism Pius X appeals to the reasoning faculty in man, to the intellect, whose rights and convincing force he valiantly defends: he exhibits before us the Eternal and the All Powerful, as discovered by the intellect—the Supreme Being whom reason points out, above and beyond all contingent existences, whom, consequently, rational man can and must worship as Lord and Master. Pius X teaches as the Royal Prophet taught, as the Apostle Paul taught. "The heavens show forth the glory of God, and the firmament declareth the work of His hands." "For the invisible things of Him, from whom the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made; His eternal

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

power also and His divinity; so that they are inexcusable, because when they knew God, they have not glorified Him as God, or given thanks." The Encyclical of Pius is the defence of God in the heavens and at the same time of the intellect in man.

The "New Theology" brings its philosophy to bear upon supernatural revelation and the person of Christ—with a similar denial of the powers of the human intellect, and, in effect, with a similar effacement of the divine in revelation and in Christ. The divine is not denied; rather its defence, we are told, is the purpose of the "New Theology." But history, and reason working upon history, we are again told, do not, cannot, there discover the divine. So far as history speaks, what is called supernatural revelation is naught but the outpouring of the spiritual emotions and the experiences of certain souls rich and exuberant above the ordinary human soul: it is the gift to humanity, from favored sons of the race, of the plenitude of their conscious and subconscious store of sentiment and truth. Those favored ones were the prophets and the sages of the ages. Jesus is one of them—the highest, indeed, and the greatest: none other so perfect as Jesus was ever seen, none other is likely to be seen. Still, so far as history teaches, the voice of Jesus, as that of other prophets, is the voice of man—the divine is not manifest. Miracles may be quoted: but they are of no avail on the pages of history, they are merely extraordinary occurrences and extraordinary manifestations of inherent, though unknown, forces of nature: the divine is not manifest. What, then, of the divine heretofore believed to belong to prophets and to Christ? What of the divine person of Christ? Must His divinity be denied, accounted a vain fancy of His followers? By no means, replies the "New Theology": let us fall back upon "Immanence," and all is made right. The divine within us recognizes the divine in the prophets of the race—especially so in Jesus. Our own spiritual emotions and experiences are not only in unison with the emotions and the experiences expressed in their teachings, but are, truly, enriched and glorified to a degree most wondrous. The divine within us is the touchstone of the divine in others: it speaks, it teaches: the prophets become men of God; Jesus, who at first was seen and known as man, is now the Son of God, very God.

What, we ask, is all this talk of "Immanence," but subjectivism of the most impotent kind—mere individualism, of no

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

effect whatever in arguing with others, who are free to say that no such emotions and experiences bubble up within their souls? No; sentiment is not argument, and the human intellect is not powerless to read the divine in history. The doctrine of fideism, of which the "New Theology" is but a recrudescence, was long ago condemned by the Church: the Church scorns a foundation for its teachings which does not rest on reason and history: it demands as its credentials the testimony of the intellect. Christ wrought His miracles, physical and moral—works which no mere natural or human power could produce—and, then, He taught with authority, and we believe His words as those of One coming from the invisible world to teach and to reform humanity—as the words of the Incarnate God, whom He declared Himself to be. This is the doctrine of the Encyclical on Modernism, and who among Christians will find fault with it?

"Immanence" moves apace. Scriptures, Church, sacraments, dogmas, pass through the same crucible and come out equally shorn of the divine splendor with which Christendom has heretofore adorned them. The Scriptures are the formulated thought and emotion of privileged prophets of humanity. The Church, as it comes before us in history, grew up with the years, in human fashion, gathering into its fabric elements from surrounding philosophies and institutions, widening its life and purposes as new needs pressed forward, or new opportunities for work unfolded themselves before its onward march. So far as history shows, it is an evolution from a natural beginning through causes and methods purely natural. Its sacraments are symbols of its natural life and aspirations, methods of its own choosing through which the individual enters into corporate union with his fellows, or expresses by outward act his continued participation in such union. Dogmas there are, but dogmas have no objective meaning save as they express the emotions and experiences of the soul, and as these emotions and experiences happen to respond to objective realities. Dogmas, too, change in form and expression, as new conditions of spiritual life and feeling arise, and new formulas are required to translate these new conditions into human speech. So far as realities may be said to underlie emotions and expressions, the realities do not change; but dogmas, the outward expression of them, do change, and are as fluctuating as were the emotions which they symbolized. The creed of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nicæa and Ephesus, good and serviceable, and in a manner true, centuries ago, may be, at a later period, out of joint with the requirements of human consciousness: and a restatement of their terms becomes imperative.

Here, again, is a fatal, most effective effacement of the supernatural and the divine. Church and Sacraments are as nothing to us if they are only natural and human: and mere trust in our inner emotions and experiences can never lift them to the plane of the supernatural. The dogmas of religion, reduced to the conditions of temporary expedients of language, no longer convey to the mind assured realities: what to-day is said in one form is to-morrow said in another. Dogmas unstable and changing in their meaning are not symbols of stable and permanent realities, such as divine truths must be: they are of no value to the Christian soul. Very different, be it noted, is this Modernist evolution of dogma from the logical development of doctrinal expression allowed in the teaching of the Church. Here there is a widening, but no changing, of meaning. With time, revealed truth is more fully apprehended by the mind of the Church, and new formulas enter into its creeds to express its better understanding of divine truth. But former expressions do not lose their original meaning: they are ever true, ever immovable from their first intent and significance.

Is there wonder that the "New Theology," in its each and every bearing, as described in the Encyclical, has been solemnly condemned by Pius X? Could he, the guardian of the "deposit," have remained silent while the axe was laid to the very roots of the tree of Christianity, and the divine sap, which alone gives to it life and reason of being, was being violently denied to its trunk and branches? Who, worshipping a God in the heavens, and adoring a Christ in history, will cast a stone at His teaching? This is an age of unbelief in the supernatural, an age of rebellion against a power above the earth, who dares to intervene, by special act or voice, in the affairs of men. Hence certain mental attitudes towards Christian revelation. One is that of the radical unbeliever, who incontinently brushes aside as fable and vain-imagining what has been heretofore held as supernatural—boldly removing God from the affairs of men, and sentencing Christ and the Christian Church to oblivion if not to contempt and opprobrium. The other, that of men un-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

willing to forego Christianity, wishing even to champion it against unbelief, who, in an imprudent anxiety to gain for it a hearing, adopt interpretations and explanations at variance with truth, more fitted to destroy than to upbuild. Against all enemies, avowed or covert, the Papacy raises its voice in tones most emphatic. It defends integral Christianity; it will allow none other.

It is not the Catholic Church alone that the Encyclical protects: it is the whole Christian religion, in its vital principles, in its foundation-stones in history and human reason. The Encyclical should be acclaimed by all Christians; by all, Pius X should be hailed as the champion of the sacred heritage in which they discern their hopes for time and eternity.

The Princeton *Theological Quarterly,* reviewing the work of a French writer, a conspicuous exponent of Modernistic ideas since condemned by the Pope, printed these words in its late October number:

"The criticism which he [the French writer] advocates is a criticism, in fact, which makes a clear sweep of all the historical foundations of the Christian system, and builds them with totally different materials and, of course, totally different results. . . . Anti-supernaturalism is the very principle of presently prevailing criticism, and as supernaturalism is the very principle of Christianity this criticism and Christianity can live together in harmony just as little as fire and water. The Abbé Loisy and Abbé Houtin . . . they may intend otherwise, they may fancy otherwise, but what they are doing . . . is to implant within it [the Roman Communion] a leaven which, if it ever becomes active, cannot stop working until it drives out every vestige of Christianity itself. The cause of the Roman Curia in this battle is sadly confused with the cause of Christianity itself."

What the Princeton *Quarterly* wrote of certain phases of so-called Modernism before Pius had spoken, it ought to write textually of the whole system, as now reprobated in the Encyclical. Of course, the Pope is dogmatic—clear and precise, firm and authoritative: a teacher having authority, and speaking to be clearly understood, necessarily is dogmatic. The Papacy is dogmatic; so was Paul; so was Christ.

An objection against the Papal claim to dogmatic authority raised by Mr. Johnston is that, logically and in fact, a claim of the kind leads to religious persecution, as is proven by the wars of religion noted in the annals of past ages. That dogmatic

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

teaching in faith and morals begets in the teacher the spirit of persecution, I very promptly deny. And there is no need that I discuss the wars of religion of which the story is evoked. To understand those wars we should understand the spirit of the times in which they occurred—times, happily, far removed from our own. And we should sift carefully the story of those wars, so as to give to the civil power and to popular uprisings their share of responsibility. I shall only remark that, besides quoting persecutions of heretics in Catholic countries, Mr. Johnston should have quoted also persecutions of Catholics under Protestant governments, some of which easily bear off the palm for unmitigated ferociousness, as Mr. Johnston's own *History of Ireland*—an admirable and most fair-minded book—so clearly shows. But let us leave the past to bury its own dead. To-day, certainly, dogmatic authority in the Papacy means naught save the right to defend, with the spiritual arms of truth, the religion of God and His Christ.

Lack of space forbids me from reviewing certain minor points in the Encyclical criticised by Mr. Johnston. I equally pass over the disciplinary parts of the Encyclical. These are of concern only to Catholics, "*affaires de famille*"—of slight interest to the general public. The chief issue raised by Mr. Johnston was the dogmatic despotism of the Papacy. Well, so far as this despotism comes before us in its teachings on Modernism, we should gratefully accept it.

Never in Christian history was there an age of such religious restlessness as is witnessed to-day: never before were such deadly shafts aimed at Christ and His Gospel: never was there so much need of clear authoritative Christian teaching. To-day, the Papacy is the sole teaching power in Christendom. The Papacy gone, no organic authority remains to defend Christ and His revelation: no solemn voice is heard speaking in tones not uncertain in behalf of the olden deposit of the Christian faith. The Papacy gone, Christianity is on the way to be, before very long, a faint whisper from the grave of a great religion that once taught and moved the nations.

JOHN IRELAND.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MODERN EDUCATION FROM A MILITARY VIEWPOINT.

BY CHARLES W. LARNED, UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY.

MODERN Education—Primary, Secondary and Higher—grew as a hybrid born of the neo-classicism of the Revival and the scholasticism of the Middle Ages, and was nurtured by a blind enthusiasm for classical culture, without definite purpose as regards the individual, society or the state. Its different phases became conventionalized, pedantic; and in an incoherent way took on accretions here and there as knowledge increased and broadened, until gradually Science, as a rival intellectual power, arose and built its school upon a separate foundation. Then came the clash between "Culture" and "Exact Thought"—the war between the *A Priori* and the Empirical, between Metaphysics and Physics, the Psychical and the Inductive — as violent and uncompromising as the old battles of the Nominalists and the Realists—whose issue is still undecided. From this conflict, schooling, as an intellectual process, has not emerged as a single organic system possessing logical coherence; but, out of a sort of armed truce have arisen two processes—the Liberal and the Scientific — sometimes wholly separated and again partly coalesced; neither, however, being wholly logical, complete and satisfactory. Of the two, the scientific and technical schools have already achieved a higher degree of logical coherence and system in their methods, and a higher percentage of definite accomplishment for a given amount of time and labor expended than their rivals; but even they, judged out of the mouths of their own hierophants, are far from perfect as teaching machines. Nevertheless, from this tangle of cross-purposes and more or less blind objectives is built the structure of what we name Education —a body of teaching complex, elaborate, costly, onerous; con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

suming a large number of the best and most vital years of our lives, and purposed to mould and develop that form of our social and political existence which we term Civilization. Indeed, philanthropists give many millions, and the States give many more, to the support and enlargement of this instrument, for the express and solemn reason that the stability of our institutions and the wellbeing of society depend upon its operation.

In the "*Economiste Français*" for September, 1890, Mr. Paul Leroy-Beaulieu, writing upon "The Influence of Civilization upon the Movements of Population," took occasion to observe that:

> "Every age is characterized by its peculiar craze. The present craze is for education unlimited and injudicious; and for philanthropy equally unlimited and injudicious—both absolutely superficial."

From the report of the Commissioner of Education for 1905 it appears that during the academic year 1904-5 there were enrolled in our educational institutions, public and private, 18,160,475 pupils, of whom 16,596,503 were taught in public, and 1,563,972 in private, schools. For their instruction there was a total expenditure of $376,996,472, which was more than one-half the entire cost of the national Government. It appears, also, that 70.35 per cent. of the school population was enrolled in the schools; and that the average daily attendance was increased to 69.7 per cent., and the average length of the school term to 159.2 days. The average number of years of schooling of 200 days each that each individual of the population received in 1905 was, for the entire country, 5.33; and as high as 7.09 in the North Atlantic Division.

This average attendance is for the entire school population, public and private. For the children of the well-to-do—"middle" and "upper" classes—however, the amount of time spent in schooling is much greater. If the limits are taken as six and twenty-one years, respectively, the university graduate will have spent fifteen years at school, with his profession yet to learn. The higher Technical School graduate will have had about the same apprenticeship, but with the advantage of having achieved his profession upon graduation; and also, because of this, of having studied harder and attained more in mental discipline and practical information. *Fifteen years of youth in both cases, and with what average net result for the expenditure?* That is a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

question which, though immensely pertinent, I do not propose to attempt to answer directly. The average college and university or "Tech" man knows pretty well what are his intellectual assets; so do his instructors. The parents and general public have an idea, more or less hazy. The question I desire to put, and to answer in a measure, is: To what are our youth entitled as the wages of their irksome drudgery? and, conversely: What should society exact in the preparation of its youth for the duties of manhood, of citizenship and of social life? Until this double question is answered authoritatively, there can be no rational, systematic or satisfactory education; and the great army of apprentices to the trade of life will have served to a greater or less extent in vain, with dispersion of energy, with misdirected effort, with incoherence of purpose, and a result both incongruous and disproportionate to the expenditure of time and labor.

Education—what is it? Surely the most solemn, the most portentous and vital of all issues.

"How to live—that is the essential question for us—the right ruling of conduct in all directions under all circumstances. In what way to treat the body; in what way to treat the mind; in what way to manage your affairs; in what way to bring up a family; in what way to behave as a citizen; how to use all our faculties to the greatest advantage to ourselves and others—how to live completely."

So Mr. Spencer; and, in turn, Huxley, he of the level head:

"That man has a liberal education who has been so trained in youth that his body is the ready servant of his will, and does with ease and pleasure the work that it is capable of; whose intellect is a clear logic engine, ready to spin the gossamer as well as forge the anchors of the mind; one who is full of life and fire, but whose passions are trained to come to heel by a rigorous will; the servant of a tender conscience who has learned to love beauty, to hate vileness, and to respect others as himself. Such a one is in harmony with nature. They will get on together rarely."

By Professor James we are told that:

"Education is the organization of acquired habits of action, such as will fit the individual to his physical and social environment."

By President Butler, that it is:

"The gradual adjustment of the individual to the spiritual possession of the race."

And from Professor Horne we learn that we are to regard it as:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The superior adjustment of a physically and mentally developed, conscious, human being to his intellectual, emotional and volitional environment."

I confess that to me the last three leave something to be desired in definiteness. I am somehow reminded of Prince Agib in the "Bab Ballads," whose

> "Gentle spirit rolls
> In the melody of souls—
> Which is pretty, but I don't know what it means";

but if true education is all of these nebulous things, and also conforms to the inspiring standards of Huxley and Spencer, then surely we are in a parlous state, for I am certain that the vast majority of our conscious human graduates do not possess a superior physical and mental adjustment to their intellectual, emotional and volitional environment, if that environment is as superior as the adjustment deserves.

As a matter of fact, in undertaking to determine what modern education actually is, we are at once forced to the conclusion that it is, first of all, almost exclusively a mental process; next, that it is either cultural or technical in nature; next, that it is one thing to the proletariat and another to the "upper classes"—the "culture" and the "high science" are not for the mass, and there are those who claim that these have no business with it, but, after a smattering of the rudiments, should hark back to the grind for bread; next, that it has no definite, practical relation to the ethical and physical development of the individual. After desultory attendance at the various institutions for teaching from text-books, the average scholar drops it all to begin school at the Academy of Life—the handworker, from the secondary school, to sweat for his daily bread; and the young gentleman, from the University or Technical Academy, to begin the really serious work of getting a gentlemanly competence in business, in the professions or in political office.

In all this period of the development of its manhood and womanhood, Society has left its own interests, and the State its safety, to chance. The Community has done nothing definite to foster its own wellbeing as a whole, or to safeguard its institutions. The system being largely "*laissez-faire*" in method and wholly individualistic in objective, the student in "higher education" is trained to that selfish end; is left as an undergraduate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to do much as he pleases; and is taught to act in after-life upon the same principle, to go as far as the law permits and as much farther as he dares—operating in and with the complex, ruthless machinery by which modern commercialism works.

> "Why, then, the world's mine oyster,
> Which I with sword will open."

Substitute "wits" for Pistol's "sword" in the quotation, and you have the principle upon which the youth of to-day is taught that the world is his prey, and the making of his fortune the sole purpose for which he is in it.

Of all the influences at work in the formative days of adolescence, the most demoralizing to the individual and disastrous to society is the exaltation of individualism that finds expression in the conception that man is a predatory animal, and that the world is by right the spoil of him of the keenest wit and strongest arm. It is the apotheosis of selfishness and the basic principle of crime. It is responsible for all the wars and all the social and political evils of all time. And, yet, it is the doctrine that is accepted and taught as the gospel of "Success"; it is the conception of life of the vast majority of the young men of the well-to-do class, who receive higher education and whose fixed conviction it is that society owes them an upholstered life; and it is the law of spoliation by which *acquisition* is synonymous with *virtue,* and *retention* with *religion.* Under its operation there is ever at work an aggressive and wide-spread series of minor encroachments upon the rights of the community which ramify throughout its fabric and subtly grow into a mighty grip upon its life—so mighty, that when any attempt is made to loosen the hold, Society is torn to its centre.

His long apprenticeship to learning has not of necessity given the young man an improved body, more skilled faculties, better habits of living, more self-control, a knowledge of the duties of citizenship, a high respect for the rights of others, refined moral perception, a knowledge of his own physical constitution and its care, or of the duties and responsibilities of a parent. It has, of persistent purpose, in no way trained him to any unselfish devotion to the interests of the State or of Society. If he has acquired any of these virtues, it was because he chose to do so by reason of special interest or personal inclination. Strange it is that, although under training for years

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and years of his impressionable youth, he should reach the fulness of manhood and citizenship without systematic discipline of body; without trained respect for law; without distinct knowledge of his social obligations to his neighbor or of the greater history of men in the struggle of the "Masses" for light and life, and for a fair share in the bounty of God's Providence. In a majority of cases, he has not even acquired what "Culture" professes to give him—disciplined powers of thought.

But, certainly, the State can ill afford the support of a higher educational system that has no sure promise of improved citizenship; Society cannot afford to sustain any course of training of the young that contains no adequate promise of a progressive humanity, of social justice and of universal wellbeing. We learn from our prophets that the moral, social, political and physical development of youth is the transcendent end of all education; from which it logically follows that a mere culture system directed solely to the intellect, and a technical system aimed merely at breadwinning, are equally defective; and that, therefore, modern Higher and Lower Education have wholly subordinated, and in some cases entirely neglected in the critical period of manhood, these higher ends for which they should principally exist and operate.

Our heritage of schooling from the Revival of Learning was a bondage to dead languages and the splendid shreds of a buried civilization; and the incongruity and incoherence of modern teaching are due to the endeavor to adapt archaic ideals and methods to a practical and scientific age. The rising generation for centuries has been fed on this grammatical diet, not with the expectation of any resultant development of character or morals or for its usefulness, but as a culture-polish and mental exercise. The grim irony of it all is that the ideal of education in which these ancient wonder-workers believed, which they enforced, and which developed the marvellous results whose remnants have been so slavishly worshipped and copied was entirely ignored.

For both the Greeks and Romans were essentially doers in their school methods. The Greeks, who have dominated the intellectual world for two thousand years, primarily developed their young men with reference to the State, and, above all, for character and physique. In the old Greek education before the Sophists, the virtue of a citizen consisted principally in his worth

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the State, and in his character-worth as an individual. The Spartans made these objectives the whole purpose of his existence, but lowered the criterion of character to a harsh military standard. The Athenians raised it to a higher plane, where philosophy, art and social ethics also claimed their share in its composition. The Athenian boy was educated first by the family, then by the State; but throughout both periods the State exercised a determinative control. For the first seven years, the boy's training was almost wholly gymnastic, and in parental hands. After seven, and until about sixteen, he attended two schools—the Palestræ, which were gymnastic, and the Music Schools, which included Poetry, History, Oratory and the Sciences as then known. From sixteen to twenty, he went to the State Academy for what was called his Ephebic training, and became to all intents and purposes *a cadet at a military academy*—two preparatory years being entirely gymnastic and ethical, and two years of military service wholly devoted to arms. In those days, therefore, the Military School was the crown and summit of educational endeavor. At the end of the first of these final two years, the youth passed a public examination in the use of arms; and, at the end of the second, another on the duties of citizenship. Throughout the whole system, there looms always the dominant and controlling purpose of *character-development* and *citizenship,* and the unvarying method of *doing* and *practising the thing taught.*

My thesis is not an analysis of Greek education, and I have referred to it only to illustrate the paradox of modern methods which have long held to a lifeless cult of the remains of Greek and Roman civilization, and ignored the methods that produced the world's standard of culture; and also to illustrate the fact that the *military school* and the *best military education* of to-day are, with few exceptions, *the only forms that are systematically inspired by any considerable degree of the Greek and Roman method and spirit.*

The military school trains for character and for the State. It systematically develops the body, and it educates the mind along a consistent line for the double purpose of clear thinking and effective practical work. It exercises the character in discipline of action; habits of subordination to lawful authority; strict personal accountability for word and act; truth-telling; integrity and fidelity to trust; simplicity of life; courage.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It requires the surrender of life and personal interest to the service of the State without hesitation and without other reward than the satisfaction of duty accomplished. It demands the renunciation of luxury and of the pursuit of wealth; and it places the service of others above the service of self, as the ideal of life. It is, therefore, essentially a school of *character,* and in its genius this function is supreme, for in character lies the highest potentiality of accomplishment in the military as in every walk of life.

I do not claim that in the military school all these things are done in the highest degree, or by a method that is even approximately perfect; and I admit that there are important elements of culture which it cannot touch. There is but one system of character-education in which the method and results are perfect; that is the one founded by the Master of Nazareth. That is wholly a school of character and of supreme wisdom, and it is an education of living and doing, and not merely of doctrine; a school of discipline; of clear thinking; of self-renunciation; of obedience; of simplicity; of devotion to society; of sacrifice of life. Character is the essential meaning, in the last analysis, of every attempt I have seen to define Education; and yet the practical mechanism by which education generally operates appears to me an exceedingly poor device to secure this development in its highest conception.

The military school, as typified by West Point, addresses itself distinctly and systematically, in a greater or less degree, to a large majority of the special functions defined by the men I have quoted; and pre-eminently to the vital principles of them all—this moulding of character. In conformity with Professor Huxley's ideal, in its dealing with the cadet, it trains his body to be the ready servant of his will; his mind to be a clear logic engine; his passions to come to heel by a vigorous will; himself, to be the servant of a tender conscience, and to respect others as himself: and, in accord with Professor James, it gives him acquired habits of action such as will fit him for his physical and social environment; while, although he may sometimes fall short of President Butler's adjustment to the spiritual possession of the race, he achieves much of Professor Horne's superior adjustment of a physically and mentally conscious human being to his complex environment. In support of this contention I propose

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to define exactly what West Point aims to do and how she does it.

First of all, she possesses an immense advantage in a clearly defined objective, which, I maintain, is a prerequisite to all successful education. This objective is the preparation of a young man to fill the position of a subaltern officer in the armies of the United States; and also to lay the foundation of such training and knowledge as is necessary to enable him to exercise the functions of whatever high command he may subsequently attain. This purpose cuts out his work for the final four years of his undergraduate life, and controls all his time and energy for that period. It is important to define just what is comprised in fitness for military command, even in a subaltern, and what is the foundation for its higher exercise. As understood at West Point it demands:—a high sense of personal honor and responsibility; a severe standard of discipline; a simple standard of life; a knowledge and reverence for Civil and Military Law; patriotism and good citizenship; courage and self-sacrifice; the capacity to think clearly; professional technical knowledge; physical health and activity.

If clear thinking is accepted as a quality of character, it will be seen that seven-ninths of the foregoing have to do with character-forming.

To secure these ends, the motive power, as I have said, is Control, and, I will add, Reward. At the period of adolescence, when character is plastic and impulse wayward, before the stereotype is set, control and reward are the essential forces for impressing permanent character upon young manhood. If the material can be removed from contaminating impurities, fused in the furnace of hard work, and kept in the mould until it is set, the best has been done that education can do for the character, provided the mould is a noble one. What West Point does for its cadets is precisely this: It takes its youth at the critical period of growth; it isolates them completely for nearly four years from the atmosphere of commercialism; it provides absorbing employment for both mental and physical activities; it surrounds them with exacting responsibilities, high standards, and uncompromising traditions of honor and integrity; and it demands a rigid accountability for every moment of their time and every voluntary action. It offers them the inducement of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an honorable and sufficient competence as a reward of success; and it has resistless authority for the enforcement of its conditions and restraints.

This machinery produces a type of man of a quality and temper altogether distinct, with habits of thought and action and views of personal responsibility free from the bias of either political or commercial interests; a subaltern officer well grounded in the elements of all branches of the military profession, possessing a character trained to see straight; a mind trained to think straight; a body physically sound disciplined to live straight; with high ideals of personal integrity and truth; with respect for law and authority; and habits of life that are clean, simple and regular.

Unlike other institutions of higher education, West Point cannot be indifferent to the general performances of its students. It exacts of every individual rigid conformity to its standard, and its minimum standard is proficiency in every branch of study taught in its curriculum. It stands *in loco parentis* not only over the mental but over the moral, physical and official man. It dominates every phase of his development, every moment of his academic existence. It becomes responsible for his physical, social and official being. There is, practically, nothing of his time over which it does not exercise a close scrutiny, and for which it does not demand a rigid accountability. It is all this that makes a "West-Pointer," and probably no other institution in the world has so strongly impressed its stamp upon the whole body of its alumni as the United States Military Academy; while very few have by their diplomas endowed the mass of their graduates with a guaranty so universally accepted as *prima facie* evidence of character and ability.

In citing the Military School and system as in any sense an exemplar in educational matters, I am aware that I shall be met at once with the protest that coercive methods and disciplinary surroundings are all very well for the restricted field of martial affairs, but will never do for the wide activities of civil life. The aspiring nature of man must be left free to develop individuality and work out an untrammelled destiny. Coercion and restraint destroy initiative and repress originality. I shall also be at odds with the *Lern-und-lehr-freiheit* doctrine of the German university, as manifested in the elective fallacies

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of our own undergraduate collegiate and university courses. To all this I make answer by a query, How comes it that the most versatile, the most original, the most subtle, the most philosophic, artistic, and at the same time scientific of temperaments was, in the Greek, developed under just such a system, and has led the world for two millenniums in every form of achievement? Is there any right function for *laissez-faire* among nine hundred and ninety-nine out of every thousand youths who are to be prepared for manhood; and is it not better in the thousandth case that the *laissez-faire* should first follow an orderly, disciplinary training of body, mind and character? The protest against discipline and control in education is precisely that of the anarchist against social organization. Is an undergraduate prepared to decide what should be the lines of his mental and character development?

The *Lern-und-lehr-freiheit* principle concerns the true university postgraduate course when the man, equipped with the fundamentals of thinking, of knowledge, of character, and of physical development, is not only in a condition to decide for himself as to his line of special investigation, culture or activity, but possesses the equipment in these fundamentals to enable him to secure the best results for himself and for others. A very distinguished Harvard graduate writes to me:

"The truth is, I regard the American academic education as resting on a basis fundamentally false, and feel that the reaction and reorganization cannot begin too soon, or be too comprehensive, or be too energetically carried forward. That in this respect I voice the sentiments of a very considerable fraction of the younger and more intelligent instructors I have conclusive evidence. In other words, as an educational system, it is the direct antithesis to West Point. I hold it to be fundamentally erroneous; in violation of all correct principles."

But, it will be demanded of me, "Granting the validity of your destructive criticism, what do you propose? Would you introduce a military discipline and curriculum into our Preparatory and Collegiate School System?" In point of fact, that very question has already been asked me by the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Liverpool in commenting upon some previous delivery of mine along these lines. Dr. Dale says:

"If he means that we should set ourselves to cultivate a higher sense of honor, courage—in the braver sense—industry, and obedience to authority, there can be no difference of opinion. If our schools fail to do

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this, they fail to discharge a most important function. If, on the other hand, he means that this can be done only on the West Point system, it might fairly be argued that West Point trains young men under special conditions to take their place and to do their work in an organization that differs widely and fundamentally from the other organized professions of our social life; and that the training of the soldier and the training of the citizen are not necessarily the same."

In endeavoring to answer so distinguished a querist, I do so with a full appreciation of the compliment paid me by his interest in my contentions, and I shall hope to be sufficiently explicit to satisfy a fair exaction. To the general question, therefore, I answer: Properly modified and adapted, yes; and in rejoinder to the assumption that the military training and system is "for young men under special conditions and to take their place and do their work in an organization that differs widely and fundamentally from the other professions of our social life," I reply:

West Point has been in existence one hundred and five years. During that period, it has produced 4,531 graduates, of whom 2,371 (more than one-half) had entered civil life up to 1902. Ignoring its military record of 460 General Officers—headed by Grant, Sherman, Meade, Sheridan, Thomas and Schofield, on the Union side, and by Robert E. Lee, the two Johnstons, Stonewall Jackson and Longstreet on that of the Confederacy—it has contributed to the forward impulse of the world: 1 President of the United States, 1 President of the Confederate States, 3 Presidential candidates, 2 Vice-Presidential candidates, 1 Ambassador, 14 Ministers Plenipotentiary, 27 Members of the United States Senate and House, 8 Presidential Electors, 16 Governors of States and Territories, 1 Bishop, 14 Judges, 17 Mayors of Cities, 46 Presidents and 14 Regents and Chancellors of Colleges and Universities, 14 Chief Engineers of States, 87 Presidents of Railroads and Corporations, 63 Chief Engineers of Railroads and Public works, 8 Bank Presidents, 200 Attorneys and Counsellors at Law, 20 Clergymen, 14 Physicians, 122 Merchants, 77 Manufacturers, 30 Editors, 179 Authors, besides artists, architects, farmers, planters, and many others belonging to useful trades and professions.

In addition, it claims one among the few American delegates to the first Hague Conference; one upon the Arbitration Conference that settled the promising little misunderstanding between

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

England and Russia; two out of seven to the recent Hague Conference. Three of its alumni are in charge of the greatest engineering work of history—the Panama Canal; and one is reorganizing the police force of the second city in the world.

Space does not permit me here to do more than indicate very broadly the lines along which I would wish to see education systematized and remodelled. I would, first and foremost, direct its energies equally, systematically and continuously towards each of the four great fundamentals—Character; Body; Mind; Citizenship. I would deprive it of its quality of being solely an irksome, mental grind—especially during its earlier stages.

For *Character,* the endeavor should be to form a body of *honor-tradition* administered by the scholars and students; and of *disciplinary requirements,* with proper penalties and rewards, enforced by authority through an administration that exacts accountability from each and every individual for every act. For the *Body,* the training should be universal, systematic and continuous; under the most careful and scientific supervision; aimed to render harmonious and vigorous the physical functions of every individual. Regular examinations should detect and the proper regimen should remedy every weakness; and nothing should be allowed to subordinate the operation of physical culture. No people can achieve a progressive civilization on a decadent physique. The sound body is of greater importance to Society than a mental development at the expense of health. Vigorous men and women are the prime essential, and cannot be purchased at too high a price. Right here, modern education is guilty of criminal neglect, for no force could be made so potent for the physical regeneration of the race as this. If no other reform is undertaken in our methods, this one should be taken up by proper organization, the country aroused, and the matter pushed until every school and educational institution in the land, primary, secondary and collegiate, is *compelled* to devote a full and sufficient amount of its energy to the bodily perfecting of its students. This is practicable, and can be enforced by law; it can be carried out at once, and would result in a regeneration of the modern man and woman. Above all, should the poor—anemic, badly nourished, under-developed, awkward—receive the care of the State for the healing of their bodies and the uplifting of their manhood. I think that every public school in the land should furnish one full, nourishing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

meal to its scholars as part of their physical training, and I believe no money devoted to education would be better spent or more prolific in good results.

For *Mind Training,* the whole curriculum of undergraduate education should be revised and reorganized by a National Congress of Educators whose decision would be made operative by law —if possible in the entire educational system, and at least in that of the public schools. I would build up an organic body of control from the bottom to the top, derived in part from the teaching *personnel,* and in part appointed by the executive authority from the active professional and industrial world—for an education not in harmony with social activities is a locomotive off the track. There should be a Secretary of Education, a Cabinet officer, with an administrative National Board of Regents; this Board should be elected by and from a National Education Board, which latter body should be the legislative and controlling power in all matters pertaining to the organization, curriculum and training system of undergraduate education as a whole. I would have it consist of one representative from each State, elected by the State Boards of Education from collegiate, technical or high schools; and an equal number appointed by the President from universities, and from the active professional, technical and labor and business world.

Education would in this way be continually inspired by the vital needs of society, and would cease to be a thing apart—of formulas and dead issues; dry bones and "the iridescent film on the surface of stagnant mind."

For *Citizenship:* here in education is the place and time for Society to organize its body politic; to make the citizen; to safeguard its institutions and defend its integrity. Here every male should be taught the elements of military organization and discipline, and to shoot straight; to understand clearly the Constitution of his country, its history and development; the organization and operation of its Government, and its legal machinery. He should equally understand State and Municipal Administration and the mechanism of the electoral body. No youth should leave school without a clear, practical knowledge of his political rights and obligations; elementary drill regulations, and the shooting of a gun; the political history of his country and of the principal nations of the world; the skilled use of his faculties—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the eye to see, the ear to hear, the tongue to speak, and the hand to execute; and the knowledge of his body, its functions and its care. Every male, rich or poor, should be practically taught the operations of some one hand trade, and the elements of the great mechanical motors. Every female, rich or poor, should be taught, besides the skilled training of her faculties, the knowledge of her bodily functions and Maternity; Domestic Economy; Sanitation, Nursing, Household Chemistry and Foods; Needlework; Domestic Architecture; and some one practical wage-earning handwork.

From primary school through college (practically the German "Gymnasium" and the French "Lycée") I would have the State determine the whole educational course—exactly what subjects are required of every youth before he is allowed to discontinue attendance; what is required, after this "Irreducible Minimum" is achieved, if he elect to continue a higher course—artistic, cultural, or technical; and what is permitted to be a matter of choice, either to the scholar or parent, at any time in the school career. At the end of the collegiate period, the hand of Regulation and Compulsion is entirely lifted; and in the true university, or elsewhere, "*Laissez-faire*" operates untrammelled.

In one respect, the State should interpose sternly and emphatically to coerce the citizen after it has trained him. He should be required under severe penalty to perform his political duties. Absence from primaries and abstention from voting should be visited with immediate punishment; and public sentiment should be educated to regard the neglect of civic duties as disgraceful to the same extent that neglect of duty is with the soldier a shame and a crime.

CHARLES W. LARNED.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ECONOMY OF ATTENTION IN THEATRICAL PERFORMANCES.

BY CLAYTON HAMILTON.

ACCORDING to the late Herbert Spencer, the sole source of force in writing is an ability to economize the attention of the reader. The word should be a window to the thought and should transmit it as transparently as possible. He says, toward the beginning of his "Philosophy of Style":

"A reader or listener has at each moment but a limited amount of mental power available. To recognize and interpret the symbols presented to him requires a part of this power; to arrange and combine the images suggested requires a further part; and only that part which remains can be used for realizing the thought conveyed. Hence, the more time and attention it takes to receive and understand each sentence, the less time and attention can be given to the contained idea; and the less vividly will that idea be conveyed."

Spencer drew his illustrations of this principle mainly from the literature of the library, but its application is even more important in the literature of the stage. So many and so diverse are the elements of a theatrical performance that, unless the attention of the spectator is attracted at every moment to the main dramatic purpose of the scene, he will sit wide-eyed, like a child at a three-ring circus, with his mind fluttering from point to point and his interest dispersed and scattered. A perfect theatrical performance must harmonize the work of many men. The dramatist, the actors main and minor, the stage-manager, the scene-painter, the costumer, the leader of the orchestra, must all contribute their separate talents to the production of a single work of art. It follows that a nice adjustment of parts, a discriminating subordination of minor elements to major, is absolutely necessary in order that the attention of the audience may be focussed at every moment upon the central meaning of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

scene. If the spectator looks at scenery when he should be listening to lines, if his attention is startled by some unexpected device of stage-management at a time when he ought to be looking at an actor's face, or if his mind is kept for a moment uncertain of the most emphatic feature of a scene, the whole effect is lost and that part of the performance is a failure.

It may be interesting to notice some of the technical devices by which attention is economized in the theatre and the interest of the audience is centred upon the main business of the moment. In particular it may be profitable to observe how a scattering of attention is avoided; how, when many things are shown at once upon the stage, it is possible to make an audience look at one and not observe the others. We shall consider the subject from the point of view of the dramatist, from that of the actor, and from that of the stage-manager.

I.

The dramatist, in writing, labors under a disadvantage that is not suffered by the novelist. If a passage in a novel is not perfectly clear at the first glance, the reader may always turn back the pages and read the scene again; but on the stage a line once spoken can never be recalled. When, therefore, an important point is to be set forth, the dramatist cannot afford to risk his clearness upon a single line. This is particularly true in the beginning of a play. When the curtain rises, there is always a fluttering of programmes and a buzz of unfinished conversation. Many spectators come in late and hide the stage from those behind them while they are taking off their wraps. Consequently, most dramatists, in the preliminary exposition that must always start a play, contrive to state every important fact at least three times: first, for the attentive; second, for the intelligent; and third, for the large mass that may have missed the first two statements. Of course, the method of presentment must be very deftly varied, in order that the artifice may not appear; but this simple rule of three is almost always practised. It was used with rare effect by Eugène Scribe, who, although he was too clever to be great, contributed more than any other writer of the nineteenth century to the science of making a modern play.

In order that the attention of the audience may not be unduly distracted by any striking effect, the dramatist must always prepare for such an effect in advance, and give the spectators an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

idea of what they may expect. The extraordinary nose of Cyrano de Bergerac is described at length by Ragueneau before the hero comes upon the stage. If the ugly-visaged poet should enter without this preliminary explanation, the whole effect would be lost. The spectators would nudge each other and whisper half aloud, "Look at his nose! What *is* the matter with his face?" and would be less than half attentive to the lines. Before Lady Macbeth is shown walking in her sleep and wringing her hands that are sullied with the damned spot that all great Neptune's ocean could not wash away, her doctor and her waiting gentlewoman are sent to tell the audience of her slumbery agitation. Thus, at the proper moment, the attention is focussed on the essential point instead of being allowed to lose itself in wonder.

A logical development of this principle leads us to the axiom that a dramatist must never keep a secret from his audience, although this is one of the favorite devices of the novelist. Let us suppose for a moment that the spectators were not let into the secret of Hero's pretty plot, in "Much Ado," to bring Beatrice and Benedick together. Suppose that, like the heroine and the hero, they were led to believe that each was truly in love with the other. The inevitable revelation of this error would produce a shock of surprise that would utterly scatter their attention; and while they were busy making over their former conception of the situation, they would have no eyes nor ears for what was going on upon the stage. In a novel, the true character of a hypocrite is often hidden until the book is nearly through: then, when the revelation comes, the reader has plenty of time to think back and see how deftly he has been deceived. But in a play, a rogue must be known to be a rogue at his first entrance. The other characters in the play may be kept in the dark until the last act, but the audience must know the secret all the time. In fact, any situation which shows a character suffering from a lack of such knowledge as the audience holds secure always produces a telling effect upon the stage. The spectators are aware of Iago's villainy and know of Desdemona's innocence. The play would not be nearly so strong if, like Othello, they were kept ignorant of the truth.

In order to economize attention, the dramatist must centre his interest in a few vividly drawn characters and give these a marked preponderance over the other parts. Many plays have failed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

because of over-elaborateness of detail. Ben Jonson's comedy of "Every Man in His Humor" would at present be impossible upon the stage, for the simple reason that *all* the characters are so carefully drawn that the audience would not know in whom to be most interested. The play is all background and no foreground. The dramatist fails to say, "Of all these sixteen characters, you must listen most attentively to some special two or three"; and, in consequence, the piece would require a constant effort of attention that no modern audience would be willing to bestow. Whatever may be said about the disadvantages of the so-called "star system" in the theatre, the fact remains that the greatest plays of the world,—"Œdipus King," "Hamlet," "As You Like It," "Tartufe," "Cyrano de Bergerac,"—have almost always been what are called "star plays." The "star system" has an obvious advantage from the point of view of the dramatist. When Hamlet enters, the spectators know that they must look at him, and their attention never wavers to the minor characters upon the stage. The play is thus an easy one to follow: attention is economized and no effect is lost.

It is a wise plan to use familiar and conventional types to fill in the minor parts of a play. The comic valet, the pretty and witty chambermaid, the *ingénue,* the pathetic old friend of the family, are so well known upon the stage that they spare the mental energy of the spectators and leave them greater vigor of attention to devote to the more original major characters. What is called "comic relief" has a similar value in resting the attention of the audience. After the spectators have been harrowed by Ophelia's madness, they must be diverted by the humor of the grave-diggers in order that their susceptibilities may be made sufficiently fresh for the solemn scene of her funeral.

We have seen that any sudden shock of surprise should be avoided in the theatre, because such a shock must inevitably cause a scattering of attention. It often happens that the strongest scenes of a play require the use of some physical accessory,—a screen in "The School for Scandal," a horse in "Shenandoah," a perfumed letter in "Diplomacy." In all such cases, the spectators must be familiarized beforehand with the accessory object, so that when the climax comes they may devote all of their attention to the action that is accomplished with the object rather than to the object itself. In a quarrel scene, an actor

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could not suddenly draw a concealed weapon in order to threaten his antagonist. The spectators would stop to ask themselves how he happened to have the weapon by him without their knowing it; and this self-muttered question would deaden the effect of the scene. The dénouement of Ibsen's "Hedda Gabler" requires that the two chief characters, Eilert Lövborg and Hedda Tesman, should die of pistol wounds. The pistols that are to be used in the catastrophe are mentioned and shown repeatedly throughout the early and middle scenes of the play; so that when the last act comes, the audience thinks not of pistols, but of murder and suicide. A striking illustration of the same dramatic principle was shown in Mrs. Fiske's admirable performance of this play. The climax of the piece comes at the end of the penultimate act, when Hedda casts into the fire the manuscript of the book into which Eilert has put the great work of his life. The stove stands ready at the left of the stage; but when the culminating moment comes, the spectators must be made to forget the stove in their horror at Hedda's wickedness. They must, therefore, be made familiar with the stove in the early part of the act. Ibsen realized this, and arranged that Hedda should call for some wood to be cast upon the fire at the beginning of the scene. In acting this incident, Mrs. Fiske kneeled before the stove in the very attitude that she was to assume later on when she committed the manuscript to the flames. The climax gained greatly in emphasis because of this device to secure economy of attention at the crucial moment.

II.

In the "Autobiography of Joseph Jefferson," that humorous and human and instructive book, there is a passage that illustrates admirably the bearing of this same principle of economy of attention upon the actor's art. In speaking of the joint performances of his half-brother, Charles Burke, and the famous actor-manager, William E. Burton, Mr. Jefferson says:

"It was a rare treat to see Burton and Burke in the same play: they acted into each other's hands with the most perfect skill; there was no striving to outdo each other. If the scene required that for a time one should be prominent, the other would become the background of the picture, and so strengthen the general effect; by this method they produced a perfectly harmonious work. For instance, Burke would remain in repose, attentively listening while Burton was delivering some humor-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ous speech. This would naturally act as a spell upon the audience, who became by this treatment absorbed in what Burton was saying, and having got the full force of the effect, they would burst forth in laughter or applause; then, by one accord, they became silent, intently listening to Burke's reply, which Burton was now strengthening by the same repose and attention. I have never seen this element in acting carried so far, or accomplished with such admirable results, not even upon the French stage, and I am convinced that the importance of it in reaching the best dramatic effects cannot be too highly estimated. It was this characteristic feature of the acting of these two great artists that always set the audience wondering which was the better. The truth is there was no 'better' about the matter. They were not horses running a race, but artists painting a picture; it was not in their minds which should win, but how they could, by their joint efforts, produce a perfect work."

I am afraid that this excellent method of team play is more honored in the breach than in the observance among our eminent actors of the present time. When Richard Mansfield played the part of Brutus, he destroyed the nice balance of the quarrel scene with Cassius by attracting all of the attention of the audience to himself, whereas a right reading of the scene would demand a constant shifting of attention from one hero to the other. When Joseph Haworth spoke the great speech of Cassius beginning, "Come, Antony, and young Octavius, come!" he was shrouded in the shadow of the tent, while the lime-light fell full upon the form of Brutus. This arrangement so distracted the audience from the true dramatic value of the scene that neither Mr. Mansfield's heroic carriage, nor his eye like Mars to threaten and command, nor the titanic resonance of his ventriloquial utterance, could atone for the mischief that was done.

In an earlier paragraph, we noticed the way in which the "star system" may be used to advantage by the dramatist to economize the attention of the audience; but it will be observed, on the other hand, that the same system is pernicious in its influence upon the actor. A performer who is accustomed to the centre of the stage often finds it difficult to keep himself in the background at moments when the scene should be dominated by other, and sometimes lesser, actors. Artistic self-denial is one of the rarest of virtues. This is the reason why "all-star" performances are almost always bad. A famous player is cast for a minor part; and in his effort to exploit his talents he violates the principle of economy of attention by attracting undue notice to a subordinate feature of the performance. That's villainous,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and shows a most pitiful ambition, as Hamlet truly says. A rare proof of the genius of M. Coquelin was given by his performances of Père Duval and the Baron Scarpia in support of the Camille and Tosca of Mme. Sarah Bernhardt. These parts are both subordinate; and, in playing them, M. Coquelin so far succeeded in obliterating his own special talents that he never once distracted the attention of the audience from the acting of his fellow star. This was an artistic triumph worthy of ranking with the same actor's sweeping and enthralling performance of Cyrano de Bergerac,—perhaps the greatest acting part in the history of the theatre.

A story is told of how Sir Henry Irving, many years ago, played the rôle of Joseph Surface at a special revival of "The School for Scandal" in which most of the other parts were filled by actors and actresses of the older generation, who attempted to recall for one performance the triumphs of their youth. Now Joseph Surface is a hypocrite and a villain; but the youthful grace of Mr. Irving so charmed a lady in the stalls that she said she "could not bear to see those old unlovely people trying to get the better of that charming young man, Mr. Joseph." Something must have been wrong with the economy of her attention.

Another story is whispered abroad; but I cannot vouch for its truthfulness. It is said that one evening when M. Maurel was performing a supporting part in "Faust," he did a brilliant piece of incidental acting while M. Jean de Reszke was singing one of the solos of the hero. When Maurel made his exit, he found himself face to face with M. Edouard de Reszke, who approached him like the rugged Russian bear. Edouard grabbed the offender by the collar. "Maurel," he said, "if you do that again when my brother is singing, I shall break every bone in your damned body!" At the next performance, Herbert Spencer's principle was rigidly observed.

The chief reason why mannerisms of walk or gesture or vocal intonation are objectionable in an actor is that they distract the attention of the audience from the effect he is producing to his method of producing that effect. Mr. Mansfield's peculiar manner of pumping his voice from his diaphragm and Sir Henry Irving's corresponding system of ejaculating his phrases through his nose gave to the reading of those great artists a rich metallic resonance that was vibrant with effect; but a person hearing either of those

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

actors for the first time was often forced to expend so much of his attention in adjusting his ears to the novel method of voice production that he was unable for many minutes to fix his mind upon the more important business of the play. An actor without mannerisms, like Adolf von Sonnenthal, is able to make a more immediate appeal.

III.

At the first night of Mr. E. H. Sothern's "Hamlet," in the fall of 1900, I had just settled back in my chair to listen to the reading of the soliloquy on suicide, when a woman behind me whispered to her neighbor, "Oh look! There are two fireplaces in the room!" My attention was distracted, and the soliloquy was spoiled; but the fault lay with the stage-manager rather than with the woman who spoke the fatal words. If Mr. Sothern was to recite his soliloquy gazing dreamily into a fire in the centre of the room, the stage-manager should have known enough to remove the large fireplace on the right of the stage.

Mme. Sarah Bernhardt, when she acted "Hamlet" in London in 1899, introduced a novel and startling effect in the closet scene between the hero and his mother. On the wall, as usual, hung the counterfeit presentments of two brothers; and when the time came for the ghost of buried Denmark to appear, he was suddenly seen standing luminous in the picture-frame which had contained his portrait. The effect was so unexpected that the audience could look at nothing else, and thus Hamlet and the queen failed to get their proper measure of attention.

These two instances show that the necessity of economizing the attention of an audience is just as important to the stage-manager as it is to the dramatist and the actor. In the main, it may be said that any unexpected innovation, any device of stage-management that is by its nature startling, should be avoided in the crucial situations of a play. Professor Brander Matthews gave an interesting illustration of this principle in his article on "The Art of the Stage-Manager," in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for February, 1904. He said:

"The stage-manager must ever be on his guard against the danger of sacrificing the major to the minor, and of letting some little effect of slight value in itself interfere with the true interest of the play as a whole. At the first performance of Mr. Bronson Howard's 'Shenandoah,' the opening act of which ends with the firing of the shot on Sumter, there

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was a wide window at the back of the set, so that the spectators could see the curving flight of the bomb and its final explosion above the doomed fort. This scenic marvel had cost time and money to devise; but it was never visible after the first performance, because it drew attention to itself, as a mechanical effect, and so took off the minds of the audience from the Northern lover and the Southern girl, the Southern lover and the Northern girl, whose loves were suddenly sundered by the bursting of that fatal shell. At the second performance, the spectators did not see the shot, they only heard the dread report; and they were free to let their sympathy go forth to the young couples."

Nowadays, perhaps, when the theatre-going public is more used to elaborate mechanism on the stage, this effect might be attempted without danger. It was owing to its novelty at the time that the device disrupted the attention of the spectators.

But not only novel and startling stage effects should be avoided in the main dramatic moments of a play. Excessive magnificence and elaborateness of setting are just as distracting to the attention as the shock of a new and strange device. When "The Merchant of Venice" was revived at Daly's Theatre some years ago, a scenic set of unusual beauty was used for the final act. The gardens of Portia's palace were shadowy with trees and dreamy with the dark of evening. Slowly in the distance a round and yellow moon rose rolling, its beams rippling over the moving waters of a lake. There was a murmur of approbation in the audience; and that murmur was just loud enough to deaden the lyric beauty of the lines in which Lorenzo and Jessica gave expression to the spirit of the night. The audience could not look and listen at the self-same moment; and Shakespeare was sacrificed for a lime-light. A wise stage-manager, when he uses a set as magnificent, for example, as the memorable garden scene in Miss Viola Allen's production of "Twelfth Night," will raise his curtain on an empty stage, to let the audience enjoy and even applaud the scenery before the actors enter. Then, when the lines are spoken, the spectators are ready and willing to lend them their ears.

This point suggests a discussion of the advisability of producing Shakespeare without scenery, in the very interesting manner that has been employed in recent seasons by Mr. Ben Greet's company of players. Leaving aside the argument that with a sceneless stage it is possible to perform all the incidents of the play in their original order, and thus give the story a greater

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

narrative continuity, it may also be maintained that with a bare stage there are far fewer chances of dispersing the attention of the audience by attracting it to insignificant details of setting. Certainly, the last act of the "Merchant" would be better without the mechanical moonrise than with it. But, unfortunately, the same argument for economy of attention works also in the contrary direction. We have been so long used to scenery in our theatres that a sceneless production requires a new adjustment of our minds to accept the unwonted convention; and it may readily be asserted that this mental adjustment disperses more attention than would be scattered by elaborate stage effects. At Mr. Greet's first production of "Twelfth Night" in New York without change of scene, many people in the audience could be heard whispering their opinions of the experiment,—a fact which shows that their attention was not fixed entirely upon the play itself. On the whole, it would probably be wisest to produce Shakespeare with very simple scenery, in order, on the one hand, not to dim the imagination of the spectators by laborious magnificence of setting, and, on the other, not to distract their minds by the unaccustomed conventions of a sceneless stage.

What has been said of scenery may be applied also to the use of incidental music. So soon as such music becomes obtrusive, it distracts the attention from the business of the play; and it cannot be insisted on too often that in the theatre the play's the thing. But a running accompaniment of music, half-heard, half-guessed, that moves to the mood of the play, now swelling to a climax, now softening to a hush, may do much toward keeping the audience in tune with the emotional significance of the action.

A perfect theatrical performance is the rarest of all works of art. I have seen several perfect statues and perfect pictures; and I have read many perfect poems: but I have never seen a perfect performance in the theatre. I doubt if such a performance has ever been given, except, perhaps, in ancient Greece. But it is easy to imagine what its effect would be. It would rivet the attention throughout upon the essential purport of the play; it would proceed from the beginning to the end without the slightest distraction; and it would convey its message simply and immediately, like the sky at sunrise or the memorable murmur of the sea.

CLAYTON HAMILTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE RELIGIOUS SITUATION.

BY GOLDWIN SMITH, D.C.L.

"I EXPRESS myself," says Bishop Butler, "with caution, lest I should be mistaken to vilify reason, which is, indeed, the only faculty which we have to judge concerning anything, even revelation itself; or be misunderstood to assert that a supposed revelation cannot be proved false from internal characters." "The faculty of reason," he says, "is the candle of the Lord within us against vilifying which we must be very cautious."

What would the world be without religion? That is the dread question which seems now to be everywhere presenting itself. Would even the social fabric remain unshaken? Has not its stability partly depended on the general belief that the dispensation, with all its inequalities, was the ordinance of the Creator, and that for inequalities here there would be compensation hereafter? The belief may not in common minds have been very present; but it would seem to have had its influence. Apparently, it is now departing. In some places it appears to have fled. Scepticism, with social unrest, comes in its room.

What is now the position of the clergy? Keepers and ministers of truth, as they are understood to be, they alone are debarred by ordination vows and tests from the free quest of truth. They are ecclesiastically bound not only to hold, but to teach and preach, as divinely revealed, what many of them must feel to have been disproved or to have become doubtful. Their uneasiness is shown by writings, such as "*Lux Mundi*," struggling to reconcile orthodoxy with free thought. It is shown by a growing tendency on the part of pastors to slide from the office of spiritual guide into that of leader of philanthropic effort and social reform. It is seen, perhaps, even in the tendency to give

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

increased prominence to musical attraction in the service. Sermons grow more secular.

Clerical biographies, such as that of Jowett, sometimes reveal private misgivings. The writer has even seen the pastorate of a large parish assumed by a man who in private society was an undisguised free-thinker and must have satisfied his conscience by promising to himself that he would do a great deal of social good. There is, no doubt, practically, more latitude than there was; heresy trials seem to have ceased, and one of the writers of "Essays and Reviews" became, without serious outcry, Primate of the Church of England. But ordination vows remain; so does the performance of a religious service which includes the repetition of creeds and forms a practical confession of faith. Hollow profession cannot fail to impair mental integrity or, if generally suspected, to kill confidence in our guides. Read Canon Farrar's "Life of Christ" and you will see to what shifts orthodoxy puts a clerical writer who was, no doubt, a sincere lover of truth.

The religious disturbance shows itself at the same time in the prevalence of wild superstitions, such as Spiritualism, rising out of the grave of religious faith, and attesting the lingering craving for the supernatural, somewhat like the mysteries of Isis after the fall of national religion at Rome.

The crisis has come on us rather suddenly, in consequence partly of great physical discoveries. The writer as a young student heard Buckland struggling to reconcile geology with Genesis. Now the struggle is to reconcile Genesis with geology. Before this wonderful advance of science and criticism combined, there had been comparatively little of avowed, still less of popular, scepticism. Rousseau was a sentimental theist; Voltaire erected a church to God. This vast "Modernism," as the poor, quaking Pope rather happily calls the ascendancy of science and criticism, has changed all. It is conceivable that, now as on some former occasions, the range of discovery may have been overrated and the pendulum of opinion may consequently have swung too far. Evolution, apparently, has still a wide space to traverse, even in what may be assumed to be the material sphere. What can it make of the marvellous stores of memory or of the apparently boundless play of the imagination, which by its working in sleep, sometimes with no assignable materials for the fancy, seems almost to show creative power? Besides, Evolution

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must itself have been evolved. What power evolved it? What power impregnated the germ with all this vast and marvellous design?

Has Deity directly revealed itself to man? It has if the Bible is inspired. Otherwise, apparently, it has not. About the Koran or the Zendavesta it is hardly necessary to speak. "The Bible" we call the Old Testament and the New bound up together, as though they contained the two halves of the same dispensation and the moral ideal of both were the same. The historical importance of the Old Testament can hardly be overrated; nor can the literary grandeur of parts of it, or the advance made by it in social character and law. When in connection with the question of American slavery attention was specially directed to the social law of Moses, no careful reader could fail to be greatly struck by its advanced humanity and civilization. Nevertheless, the morality of the Old Testament is tribal, while that of the New Testament is universal. The tribal character of the Old Testament morality is seen in the destruction of the first-born in Egypt to force Pharaoh to let the Chosen People go; in the invasion of Canaan and the slaughter of the Canaanites; in the murder of Sisera; in the approval of the treason of Rahab; in David's putting to torture the inhabitants of a captured city. The attempt to reconcile all this with universal morality by styling it the course of "Evolution" can hardly avail, since the spirit of tribal separatism dominates in the latest books of the Old Testament, Ezra and Nehemiah, where Israelites are not only forbidden for the future to marry with Gentiles, but bidden to put away Gentile wives. It is true there are glimpses of a universal dominion of the God of Israel, and of the happiness to be enjoyed by all nations under it. Still, it is Jehovah, Israel's God.

Were the Old Testament a Divine revelation it would certainly be free from error concerning the works of Deity, which plainly it is not. The narrative in Genesis of creation, compared with other primitive cosmogonies, is rational as well as sublime. But if Professor Buckland could persuade his hearers he could not persuade himself. Later still, we had Gladstone striving with his wonderful gift of interpretation to show that the Creator in dictating an account of the creation had come wonderfully near the fact. The process of the creation, its

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chronology, and its order, Noah's flood, the ages of the Patriarchs, the stopping of the sun by Joshua, are all apparently death-blows to the simple faith with which our childhood read the Old Testament. The hare is made a ruminating animal, and the excuse apologists offer for the mistake, without curing it, only stamps it more distinctly as an offspring of human simplicity.

Largely good the influence of the Old Testament has no doubt been; largely also it prepared the way for the New. That its influence has been wholly good cannot be said. It has furnished fanaticism with aliment and excuse. It has found mottoes for the black flag of religious war.

Is it possible to believe, in face of doubtful authenticity, contradictions as to fact, and traces of local superstition, that the New Testament any more than the Old was dictated by Deity? Inspired by the creative power, in common with the other works of creative beneficence, as a part of the general plan, the New Testament may have been. Its morality is not tribal, but universal. This beside the well of Samaria was proclaimed. If there is any privilege it is in favor not of race, but of class, the class being the poor, whose poverty seems counted to them as virtue, perhaps rather to the disparagement of active goodness.

Had the New Testament been divinely inspired, would not its authority have been clearly attested? Would not the authorship of its books have been made known? Would the slightest error or self-contradiction have been allowed to appear in it? What is the fact? The authenticity of a large portion of the Epistles of St. Paul is admitted by the critics; of the other books of the New Testament the authorship is regarded as doubtful. The three Synoptic Gospels have a large element common to them all, and are evidently grafts upon a single document which is lost, and which the critics generally seem inclined to place not earlier than the latter part of the first century. The Synoptics all tell us that when Jesus expired the veil of the Temple was rent. One adds that there was preternatural darkness; a third that the earth quaked, that the rocks were rent, that the graves opened, and many bodies of the saints which slept arose, came out of the graves after the resurrection of Jesus, went into the holy city, and appeared to many. It is plain that such portents must have produced an immense sensation; such a sensation, it may be assumed, as would have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

brought scepticism to its knees. This surely must be legendary, and the legend must have had time to grow.

Though grafts on the same original stock, the Synoptic Gospels are often at variance with each other; as in the case of the genealogy of Jesus upon which the Harmonists labor in vain; in that of the marvels attending his birth; in that of his keeping the Passover or his Last Supper; in that of the resurrection, which again baffles the skill of the Harmonists. Here, surely, is proof that the pens of the narrators were not guided by Omniscience.

Concerning the miracles of the casting out of devils generally, and in particular of the casting out of a legion of devils into a herd of two thousand swine at Gadara, what is to be said? Are these not clearly cases of human imagination set at work by a Jewish superstition? Is it possible that they should have had a place in a divine narrative of the life of the Saviour of the world? The Fourth Gospel omits them. Orthodoxy would fain persuade itself that this was to avoid unnecessary repetition.

Satan from the top of a mountain shows Jesus all the kingdoms of the earth. This seems to imply belief that the earth is a plane. The movement of the star of the Nativity seems to imply belief in the rotation of the heavens.

About the authorship of the Fourth Gospel, and, consequently, about its title to belief, there has been endless controversy among the learned. But there are pretty plain indications, in the shape of the omission of the demoniac miracles and some lack of local knowledge, that it is not the work of a Palestinian Jew. Opening with a reference to the Logos, it strikes the key of Alexandrian philosophy. It is, indeed, rather theological than historical, so that it has been not inaptly compared to the Platonic, in contrast to the Xenophontic, account of Socrates, and the theology seems like that of a post-evangelical era. Martineau's conclusion is that "the only Gospel which is composed and not merely compiled and edited, and for which, therefore, a single writer is responsible, has its birthday in the middle of the second century, and is not the work of a witness at all." Historically, this Gospel is at variance with the others in its narrative of the Last Supper. "The incidents," says the highly orthodox Speaker's Commentary, "are parallel with sections of the Synoptic Gospels; but there are very few points of actual correspondence

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in detail between the narratives of the Synoptists and of St. John." Something more than impressive resemblance would surely have been found between narratives, equally authentic and inspired, of a momentous crisis in the life of the Saviour.

"At this point, that is to say the beginning of the Galilean ministry, we are again met by difficulties in the chronology, which are not only various, but to the certain solution of which there appears to be no clue. If we follow exclusively the order given by one Evangelist we appear to run counter to the scattered indications which may be found in another. That it should be so will cause no difficulty to the candid mind. The Evangelists do not profess to be guided by chronological sequences." So writes Dean Farrar in despair. Is it likely that such confusion would be found in a Divine revelation? Would not the narratives have been as well arranged and clear as, by the admission of Orthodoxy, they are the reverse? Would the names of the authors of the Gospels, their warrants and the sources of their information, have been withheld? Providence surely was not here.

If there was a miraculous revelation on which salvation depended, why was it not universal? Why has it all this time been withheld from nations even more in need of it than those to whom it was given? Are we to suppose that the salvation of these myriads was a matter of indifference to their Creator, or that Heaven preferred the slow and precarious working of the missionary to the instantaneous action of its own fiat? This is the question which scepticism asks, and which the great author of the "Analogy of Religion" fails to answer.

What did Jesus think of himself and his mission, and of his relation to Deity? This it seems impossible without more authentic records clearly to decide. The Gospel of St. John, which is the most theological, would appear to be the least trustworthy of the four. Its author, apparently, sees its subject through a theosophic medium of his own. The idea of the teacher in the mind of the disciples would naturally rise with his ascendancy; so, perhaps, would his own idea. If Jesus is rightly reported he believed himself to be the Son of God, exalted to union and participation in spiritual dominion with the Father, and destined together with the Father to judge the world. But, in his mortal hour of anguish in Gethsemane, he prays to the Father to let the cup pass from him; an act hardly consistent with the doc-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trines of the Athanasian Creed. In the immortality of the soul and judgment after death he plainly believes. But he does not substantiate the belief by any explanation of the mode of survival; nor, in separating the two flocks of sheep and goats, does he say how mixed characters are to be treated. Tribalism seems slightly to cling to his conception of the just gathered in Abraham's bosom. Of his apologue of Dives and Lazarus, the last part appears to show that the world beyond the grave was to him a realm of the imagination.

The Sermon on the Mount would appear, by the strong impress of character it bears, to have special claims to authenticity. So may the Parables habitually employed as instruments of teaching and wearing apparently the stamp of a single imagination.

That with Jesus of Nazareth there came into the world, and by his example and teaching was introduced and propagated a moral ideal which, embodied in Christendom, and surviving through all these centuries the action of hostile forces the most powerful, not only from without, but from within, has uplifted, purified, and blessed humanity is a historical fact. With the civilization of Christendom no other civilization can compare. But we have been accustomed to believe that there was a miraculous revelation of the Deity. A revelation of the Deity, though not miraculous, Christianity may be believed to have been.

Revelation, direct and assured, of the nature, will, designs, or relation to us of the Deity through the Bible or in any other way we cannot be truly said to have. All that we apparently can be said to have, besides the religious instinct in ourselves, is the evidence of beneficent design in the universe; balanced, we must sadly admit, by much that with our present imperfect knowledge appears to us at variance with beneficence; by plagues, earthquakes, famines, torturing diseases, infant deaths; by the sufferings of animals preyed on by other animals or breeding beyond the means of subsistence; by inevitable accidents of all kinds; by the Tower of Siloam everywhere falling on the just as well as on the sinner. There may be a key, there may be a plan, disciplinary or of some other kind, and in the end the mystery may be solved. At present there seems to be no key other than that which may be suggested by the connection of effort with virtue and the progress of a collective humanity.

At the same time, we may apparently dismiss belief in a great

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

personal power of evil and in his realm of everlasting torture. The independent origin of such a power of evil is unthinkable; so is the struggle between the two powers and its end. There is no absolutely distinct line between good and evil. The shades of character are numberless.

Another great change, rather of impression than of conviction, has been creeping over the religious scene. We have hitherto, largely, perhaps, under the influence of the Bible, been fancying rather than thinking that this little earth of ours was the centre of all things, the special object of interest to the Creator; and that the grand drama of existence was that enacted on this terrestrial stage and culminating in Redemption. Astronomical science is now making us distinctly feel that this world is only one, and, if magnitude is to be the measure, very far from the most important, of myriads of worlds governed by the same physical laws as ours, forming a system of which ours is a member, while the destiny of the whole system is to us utterly inscrutable; proofs of the most sublime and glorious order presenting themselves on the one hand, while on the other we see signs of disorder and destruction, errant bodies such as comets and aërolites, a moon without an atmosphere, the conflagration of a star. Whether the whole is moving towards any end and, if it is, what that end is to be, we cannot hope to divine. When with Infinity we take into our thought Eternity, past and future, if in Eternity there can be said to be past or future, our minds are completely overwhelmed.

Is belief in a future life generally holding its ground? My friend, the late Mr. Chamberlain, was by no means alone in resigning it. But if this life is all, how can we continue to hold our faith in divine justice? Mr. Chamberlain, as I said before, was evidently happy as well as good. His life, though short and regarded by him as ending in the grave, was to him so much gain, and proved beneficence on the part of the Author of his being. But if Mr. Chamberlain's theory is true, what is to be said in the case of the myriads to whom life has been wretchedness, ending perhaps in agony, often without the slightest responsibility on their part? For these unhappy ones would it be well, as Mr. Chamberlain holds it was for him, that there should be no hereafter? Is their being brought into existence only to suffer compatible with our faith in supreme benevolence? Is con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fidence in supreme justice compatible with the conviction that the tyrant and the tortured victims of his tyranny, alike, repose forever in the grave? Such, it is true, was the belief of the Hebrew; indication of any other belief, at all events, he has left us none, unless it be a faint glimpse of Sheol. The philosophy of Job halts accordingly. The Hebrew believed that he would be rewarded or punished in his posterity.

Bishop Butler's grand argument for belief in the possibility of a future life goes upon the supposition that our conscious personality is distinct and separable from our perishable frame, and is in itself "indiscerptible," so that there is no reason why it should not survive the death of the body. To prove that it ever has survived the death of the body, or to show the mode of its survival, the Bishop does not attempt. But Butler lived long before Evolution and the general advance of physiology in these later days. Johnson, who was no sceptic, owned that he yearned for more light on the "spiritual world," by which he apparently meant immortality.

Positivism tenders us endless existence as particles in a collective humanity, the "colossal man." But would there be much satisfaction in existence when individuality and personal consciousness had been lost? Would the prospect lead the ordinary man to work and suffer for the future generations, at all events, for any beyond the circle of the immediate objects of his love? What the end of the colossal man is to be seems undetermined. The Positivist Church has produced very good and beautiful lives, but its power as a religion to go alone would be more clearly seen were not Christianity at its side.

The writer is not tendering proofs, but asking for them, stating the difficulties which prevail, and pleading for perfect freedom of discussion. Otherwise he would ask whether there is not still something in human nature apparently unsusceptible of physical explanation and seeming to point to the possibility of a higher state of being. Evolution may ultimately explain our general frame, emotional and intellectual, as well as physical. It may in time explain the marvels of imagination and memory. It may explain our æsthetic nature with our music and art. It may explain even our social and political frame and our habit of conformity to law. But beyond conformity to law, social or political, is there not, in the highest specimens of our race at

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

least, a conception of an ideal of character and an effort to rise to it which seem to point to a more spiritual sphere?

Necessarianism, whether in the philosophic form or in that of the Westminster Confession, would apparently make short work of all moral questions by reducing us to automatons. But Necessarianism depends on the assumption that there is only one factor in action, namely, motive; and that, if you knew the agent's motive, you could invariably predict his action. But reflection tells us that there are two factors in action, motive and volition, and that of this we are conscious as often as we hesitate in action, though not when the action is a matter of course.

One great change in the ecclesiastical world appears to be at hand. The Papal autocracy was the creation of Hildebrand, who for that purpose allied himself with Norman Conquest, and demanded of William the Conqueror the political homage which the Conqueror was too strong to yield, but which Popes, notably Innocent III, afterwards succeeded in extorting from weaker kings. Before Hildebrand there had been only a western Primacy or Patriarchate round which, when western Christendom had lost connection with the east and the Empire, the people of the west gathered for guidance and cowered for protection. Gregory the Great, while in the case of Phocas he showed his interest in the affairs of the Empire, put forth no claim to dominion. To the recognized autocracy, when that yoke was slipped off by the political powers, succeeded, as the instrument of Papal influence, the Jesuit with his intrigues. Disestablishment has now prevailed in France. It is apparently coming in Spain. "Modernism" advances with the advance of science even in the priesthood. But what is to follow on the fall of the Papacy, a general dissolution or a reunion of Christendom on the broad, moral basis of the Christian ideal, of which there are some signs, the next generation may see. The present generation can do little more than plead for a free course for truth.

GOLDWIN SMITH.

P.S.—It may be remembered that not long ago the London "Daily Telegraph" published a selection from a series of nine thousand letters which had been received by it in three months from people seeking light on the subject of religion. The subject, therefore, is thoroughly and urgently before the world.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REPUBLIC AND MONARCHY: FIFTEEN YEARS OF FRENCH DIPLOMACY.

BY ANDRE TARDIEU, FOREIGN EDITOR OF "LE TEMPS."

THE foreign policy of contemporary France is original in two particulars,—a republican policy is brought face to face with monarchical policies, and a new diplomacy has to treat with the old traditional diplomacy. Of course, changes in the form of government do not necessarily affect diplomatic relations between different nations. Thus, history shows us Francis I, "the very Christian king," holding diplomatic intercourse with "the unspeakable Turk"; Richelieu treating with Protestants, and Mazarin negotiating with the regicide Cromwell. It must be admitted, however,—and we have frequently experienced this fact since 1871—that a country which has changed its institutions in the direction of greater liberty is looked upon, for various reasons, with a sort of suspicion by the governments of the old régime. In the first place, such a country is considered a kind of revolutionary centre, which sets a dangerous example to monarchical peoples of indiscipline and rebellion, and, in the second place, it is held that democracies cannot pursue a foreign policy with any continuity. But it can be fairly said that French diplomacy, during the past fifteen years, has triumphed over these difficulties, and this fact may be set down as not one of its smallest merits. But it has had other good points. It has struck out on new lines, making the basis of its activities an alliance—that with Russia—and a friendly understanding—that with England, which had long been held as desirable, but which became a reality only recently. This double originality characteristic of French foreign policy during the Third Republic gives it a peculiar stamp which a free country like the United States will fully appreciate.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The first thing French diplomacy had to do on the foundation of the present Republic was to escape from the isolation which was the inevitable consequence of the disasters of 1870. It is only the strong who are respected and courted. The period covered by the National Assembly (1871-77) was one of simple reconstruction, and the presidency of M. Grévy (1879-87) represented a season of meditation and waiting. It was not till M. Carnot entered the Elysée (1887-94) that France, finally feeling herself on her feet again, turned her attention to the outside world. The first glance abroad was not reassuring. Bismarck at that moment still exercised an unquestioned supremacy throughout Europe, grasping with an iron hand the reins of the Triple Alliance. Austria and Italy obeyed him with docility. Spanish sympathies turned towards Germany, and England felt a hostility to France on account of her course in Egypt and because of numerous colonial rivalries. France was surrounded by a circle of hatred, antipathy or ill-disposed indifference; while, at the other end of Europe, Russia, so different from France in many respects, was attracted to her by the similarity of her diplomatic situation. She, too, was a victim of Prince Bismarck. The Berlin Congress of 1878 crushed her hopes of at last putting her hands on Constantinople, just as the Treaty of Frankfort of 1871 registered the defeats of France; she suffered with impatience the Teutonic yoke under which all Europe was chafing. Hence it was that both parties—St. Petersburg and Paris—recognized that an alliance between the two countries was as natural as it was necessary, especially as Bismarck himself, thirty years before, had predicted such an occurrence. The bringing about of this alliance not only marked the end of France's isolation, but it also announced her reappearance on the European diplomatic stage, for a nation with a foreign policy does not stand alone, solidarity being the first of international laws when a country passes from a state of observation to one of action.

The Franco-Russian alliance has made it possible for France to view calmly its whole foreign political field. For twenty years, she had been pursuing a fine colonial activity, but only with the tacit consent of Germany, which thought it wise to encourage her in these distant enterprises, as they kept her mind from brooding on the question of her eastern frontier. But with the advent of the Russian alliance she escaped this sort of tutelage

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and can now look after her own affairs in her own way. A glance at the map shows that, outside of a Franco-German war, it is on the Mediterranean only that France can find a field for her activities. There she possesses two first-class colonies—Algeria and Tunis,—which give her perhaps the leading place in the western part of that portion of the world. But they are exposed to several dangers so long as Morocco continues to be in a chronic state of anarchy.

The first of these dangers arises from the nature of the Mohammedan population of those regions, the various countries being closely bound together, notwithstanding separating boundary lines. The spirit of revolt is there contagious. The second danger arises from the temptation that some other European nation might feel to intervene in Moroccan affairs and seek to gain a dominant influence there. This would be a direct menace to France's colonies of Algeria and Tunis. Consequently, in order to protect her present possessions in northwest Africa, France must prevent all nations, except herself or her allies, from securing a predominant position in Morocco; and, in the second place, she must, through a system of wise reforms, bring about an orderly government in that distracted land. In other words, France has to apply there a sort of African Monroe Doctrine. I may add that, through force of circumstances, this new Morocco Doctrine was formulated while M. Delcassé was our Minister of Foreign Affairs (1898-1905), and since then it has held the first place in French foreign policy, bringing about in 1905-1906 a grand diplomatic contest in which all the leading nations took part.

Before the meeting of the Algeciras Conference, it was found that, if France were to carry through her Moroccan policy and to take an active part in general European foreign politics, she must have other backing than the Russian alliance. It was necessary to strengthen that alliance by complementary understandings,—with England, in the first place, and next with Italy and Spain. The negotiations occasioned by the necessity for this triple understanding, with the side issues which they created, form the greater part of the diplomatic history of France during the last five years.

France began the task by making approaches to Italy, where her object could be more easily attained on account of economical

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

causes, which now play such a large part in international relations. It was to the commercial interest of Italy to turn towards France. The Franco-Italian tariff war had cost Italy more than it had cost France, the influx of German capital on the other side of the Alps having given but momentary relief, and when, in 1900, a financial crisis broke upon Germany, a serious disaster would have befallen the young kingdom if France had refused financial aid to Italy. The treaty of commerce negotiated in 1898 between the two countries was the first step towards this much-desired reconciliation, and the good work was completed by the agreements brought about in November, 1900, and December, 1902, by which Italy left France free to act in Morocco in exchange for a similar liberty for herself in Tripoli. At the same time, France was assured, though the importance of this concession must not be exaggerated, that Italy's presence in the Triple Alliance was no longer a menace to France.

The good understanding with England followed that with Italy. At first, this move was regarded with scepticism; but, in the end, it won the confidence of both nations. At the start, it was to affect only old colonial quarrels; but to-day it has become a universally accepted basis of all diplomatic action. This is unquestionably the most brilliant and the boldest international act of the past thirty years. When, in 1902, King Edward announced his intention of making an official visit to Paris with the approval of the French Government, it was feared in some quarters that this act might occasion grave disorders or hostile manifestations in the Paris streets, which it might be difficult to cope with. But the journey was a more marked success than even the most sanguine had hoped for, and was the starting-point for the negotiations which ended with the agreement between the two countries signed on April 8th, 1904. Passing over the accessory articles, the two main features of this treaty are that France recognizes the situation which England has assumed in Egypt, while England stands ready to approve the course which France may pursue in Morocco.

A few months later, a Franco-Spanish agreement was brought about,—the last link in this international chain which was to control the Mediterranean and Moroccan policy of the French Government; and, at the same moment, it opened up a period of difficulties. France had at last perceived, and perceived

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rightly, that it was in the direction of the Mediterranean that she could reap new fruits. But, however rich this fruitage might be, she should not have been hypnotized thereby and should not have lost sight of the real situation on the European Continent and in the world in general. At the very moment when, armed with these three important supports—the Franco-Italian, the Franco-English and the Franco-Spanish understandings—M. Delcassé concentrated all his attention on Morocco, the governing influences on the Continent were unfavorable to the carrying out of the plans which the French Foreign Office had in view.

Germany, for instance, was ruffled at seeing these various combinations brought about without her having anything to say about them, and she was apprehensive concerning this good understanding between France and England at the moment when Anglo-German relations were very much strained. In a word, Berlin was simply waiting for a favorable occasion when she could intervene and give vent to her pent-up anger. And at the same time, Russia, foolishly dragged by imprudent statesmen and unscrupulous men of business, whose moneyed interests were in the Far East, into a losing war with Japan, found herself momentarily without weight in the councils of Europe. A cool head and even a little foresight should have sufficed to convince any one that at such a time the greatest prudence should be exercised. But M. Delcassé seems to have shut his eyes to the danger, with the result now known to everybody.

German hostility suddenly showed itself at a moment when the military strength of France was not all that it might have been, and when her allies were in an embarrassed position. Paris was seized with a panic, M. Delcassé was forced to throw up his portfolio under conditions that were not agreeable to our national pride, and M. Rouvier, stepping into the vacant place, did his best to pull the country out of this Moroccan slough. It was a sad period—this smoothing down of old difficulties and the beginning anew again. Its moving history I have told in my book, "The Conference of Algeciras." Thanks to the ability of French diplomacy and the fidelity of her allies and friends, France finally got out of the difficulty much more successfully than she had a right to hope for.

At the very start, France agreed to the demand that her plan for the reform of Morocco should be submitted to the approval

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the other nations, on condition that Germany should not call in question, at the Conference about to open, certain governing principles of the Moroccan policy of France. The Franco-German agreements, drawn up in July and September, 1905, after weary negotiations, of whose daily progress I was a witness, prepared the way for the calling together of the Conference which was held at Algeciras from January 5th to April 7th, 1906.

This Conference was not only interesting from a Mediterranean and Moroccan standpoint, but it was even more important, as came out more and more clearly as the proceedings went on, as an occasion for a sort of "resistance test" of the alliances, understandings and friendships so rife in Europe at that moment. Thus, the Russian Alliance then came to the fore again; for the war in Manchuria was over, and Russia was bringing her troops back to Europe. So Russia became a great aid to her ally, and the energetic instructions sent on March 19th, 1906, by Count Lamsdorf to Count Cassini, his representative at the Conference, did much to bring about the final result, which, taken all in all, was favorable to France, for authority was given to her, in conjunction with Spain, to police the eight Moroccan ports. The severest diplomatic attacks witnessed at the Conference had to be met by the Franco-English friendship. In 1905, a few months before the meeting of the Conference, Germany did her best to break it by trying to frighten France by threatening war. We have not forgotten the demands of the chief fuglemen on the German side—Professor Schiemann, Prince Henckel von Donnersmarck and von Holstein—that France must give hostages to keep the peace! Again, in 1906, when the Conference convened, a bolder attempt was made to trouble France's relations with England. It was given out that Great Britain, having got out of the understanding all that could be got out of it, was now quite ready to shake it off, become free again and then to enter into an agreement with Germany! Not only did the "*entente cordiale*" stand firm against all these insidious attacks, but it came out of the struggle stronger than ever. This good understanding made itself felt in all the capitals of Europe, as well as at Algeciras. The intimate and continual collaboration of the French and English representatives was especially marked at Madrid in the persons of M. Jules Cambon and Mr. Cartwright, the British *Chargé d'Affaires;* in Rome, in the persons of M.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Barrère and Mr. Egerton; and in St. Petersburg, in the persons of M. Bompard and Sir Charles Hardinge. It was the cynosure of all eyes, presenting a solid front capable of balancing the effects of the Triple Alliance. To use a scientific term, at Algeciras the Anglo-French agreement passed from the static to the dynamic state.

The Algeciras Conference was also a test of the strength of the Triple Alliance, and I do not think it can be said that that Alliance came out of this trial rejuvenated. Italy, very much annoyed by this dispute, which set its Continental engagements of 1882 against its Mediterranean engagements of 1900 and 1902, tried from the very first day of the meeting to be faithful to both. That was not what Germany had expected. She wished the Italian plenipotentiary to act as her second in this international duel; only this and nothing more. But Italy still belongs to the Triple Alliance, and though I do not share the opinion of some of my fellow countrymen that she belongs to it only for the form, I think she interprets her obligations in a far more liberal sense than was formerly the case. And this change dates from Algeciras.

As for Austria, the other member of the Triple Alliance, she played at Algeciras a conciliatory part, which the German Emperor has publicly approved. But, though she was scrupulously correct in her relations to the German Foreign Office, she always strove during the Conference to maintain her intellectual and moral liberty. The Triple Alliance, consequently, still stands, but I do not think I go too far when I say that its character has been modified. It is now less despotic and, if I may be permitted the expression, more parliamentary.

Thus, the upshot of this acute European crisis, which I have called "the conflict of the alliances," was that all the diplomatic combinations stood, at the end of the Conference of Algeciras, just about where they stood at the beginning of the Conference. In a word, there was no marked, material change in the international arrangements which had so provoked the anger of Germany. This fact comes out perfectly clearly in the speech delivered in the German Reichstag on November 14th, 1906, by Prince von Bülow, when he had only honeyed words for these combinations, some of his expressions meaning explicitly, others implicitly, that he accepted the new situation created by M. Del-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cassé's policy, to which, however, Germany had been so firmly opposed in 1905. It is not surprising, therefore, that this policy, which has sometimes been called "the policy of Eastern understandings," has constantly developed since the spring of 1906—that is, since the close of the Algeciras Conference. In the first place, it has been strengthened by the two identical treaties which Spain has signed with France and with England, and which are mutual guarantees of the *status quo* in the western Mediterranean and in the eastern Atlantic; and, in the second place, three other agreements, of which Europe is not the theatre, have in various ways rendered the relations of France with her allies and friends more precise and more easily carried out. A word about these three acts.

More than once in the past, the rivalries between England and Russia have given some ground for surprise at France's simultaneous good understanding with these two Powers. But the Anglo-Russian agreement, brought about a few months ago, has removed this difficulty. The Russo-Japanese war was the cause of much of France's trouble with Germany in 1905, and it was only too plain that any friction between the Governments of St. Petersburg and Tokio was sure to be an embarrassment for France. But the Russo-Japanese agreement of last year, which greatly strengthens the treaty of Portsmouth, makes for a durable peace between those two countries. Thirdly, the recent Franco-Japanese treaty, which guarantees the Asiatic possessions of the contracting parties, adds another trump card to the very strong hand held by France. I may further add that the present improved state of the relations between England and Germany is favorable to the maintenance of peace, which is a source of unconcealed pleasure in France.

The survey of these alliances and friendships, with their bearings on French politics, would not be complete without a word as to the amicable relations which exist between France and the United States. The foundation of this friendly feeling was laid back beyond the past century, and it is a pleasure to perceive that it grows firmer with the years. I need not dwell on the fresh evidences of this friendship which have been seen on several occasions during recent years and which are so free from all thought of compensation of any kind; nor need I point out the probability that nothing will ever disturb these happy rela-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions; for the two countries have no conflicting interests. But I wish to record the fact that France is very grateful to the American Government for what it did during the difficulties of 1905 and 1906, which have just been dwelt upon. I can speak all the more honestly of this gratefulness, because American diplomacy, faithful to its governing principles, did not take a light view of the part it could play at the Algeciras Conference, where, on the contrary, swayed by a noble wish to have peace prevail, it resolved to give its vote to the side which presented the most reasonable and equitable case; and it so happened that, in this instance, it was France which fulfilled these conditions. We believe in France that President Roosevelt is still high in praise of the frankness of our intentions at Algeciras, and his approval of our course gives us deep pleasure, for we look upon the present incumbent of the White House as a man of good judgment, large heart and marked ability.

France is often misjudged abroad because she takes an unhealthy pleasure in fouling her own nest. We Frenchmen sometimes carry so far our hatred of hypocrisy that we are apt to boast of our vices. I am well aware of our national weaknesses. Too much importance is often given to our interior quarrels. The different political parties hurt the country by their excesses. The larger interests of the nation are sacrificed to the lesser. Some Frenchmen, however, hold that, if faults do really exist, they should not be dwelt upon. This means living continually in a fool's paradise, which is as bad for nations as for individuals. The country which is told and accepts that famous remark: "Not a gaiter-button is missing," is apt to wake up some fine morning in Sedan! Let it be admitted that contemporary France has her faults, but let it be added that she also has her merits. And among these merits is surely this diplomatic achievement, whose principal outlines and essential features I have just given, and whose chief creators have been the ten or more Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the past fifteen or sixteen years, of whom I shall say a word in closing.

The more recent occupants of the Palace of the Quai d'Orsay have differed considerably from one another, as regards their early beliefs, their tendencies, their intellectual calibre and their moral character. Glancing for a moment at the more important of them, I would say that M. Hanotaux has nothing in common

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with M. Ribot or M. Delcassé. M. Rouvier cannot be likened to M. Bourgeois, while the latter does not at all resemble the present incumbent, M. Pichon. But, notwithstanding these differences and in some cases these antinomies, a well-formed French foreign policy has been created, which may sometimes have varied, shown signs of indecision and even made positive mistakes, but which, on the whole, has been consistent in its aim and in the means employed to attain its object. It has, for instance, been faithful to the initial alliance with Russia, trying to complete it, but, at the same time, careful not to sap its strength; negotiating the English treaties and striving to harmonize them with the Russian understanding; limiting its efforts to a single field—the north African and Mediterranean regions—and, in spite of some rebuffs, getting nearer and nearer its goal. For it cannot be questioned that, at the present moment, in spite of the difficulties arising from the anarchy which now prevails in Morocco, the peculiarly privileged position which France occupies in that country, a position, however, which does not imply a spirit of conquest or monopoly, is to-day far less questioned by the interested Powers than was the case three years ago.

Is there, then, in all Europe—if we except England, perhaps—another country whose diplomatic activity has been as tenacious, as unremitting and as successful as that of France? I do not think so. I am always ready to admit that diplomacy, unless backed by military force, is of little avail. I am convinced that France should have an eye to other means of defence. Nor do I despair of our seeing the situation in this light; and if we need the encouragement of examples of patriotic energy, these examples are not far to seek; and for one such we have simply to turn to the United States.

ANDRE TARDIEU.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE "BLACK HAND" MYTH.

BY GAETANO D'AMATO, FORMER PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED ITALIAN SOCIETIES.

IT is not strange, perhaps, that most Americans believe that a terrible organization named the "Black Hand Society" exists in Italy, and is sending its members to establish branches for the purpose of plundering the United States, since nearly every newspaper in the country conveys that impression to its readers. One would think, however, that such men as Frank P. Sargent, Commissioner-General of Immigration, and Terence V. Powderly, Chief of the Division of Information of that Bureau, would inform themselves on a matter that pertains so closely to their duties. Nevertheless, both of these officials have put themselves on record as believing that such an organization exists. In his last annual report Mr. Sargent says, apropos of the suggestion that legislation be adopted requiring the presentation of a passport as a prerequisite to the examination of an alien applying for admission to the United States: "The current history of the perpetration of heinous crimes throughout the United States by foreigners domiciled therein, especially by the members of the 'Black Hand' and other like societies in evidence," etc. Again, in a recent article on "Undesirable Citizens," he refers to "the introduction into this free country of such hideous and terrifying fruits of long-continued oppression as the 'Black Hand' and anarchist societies."

Mr. Powderly is more specific. In an interview in the New York "Sun," he declared that he had learned in Italy last summer that "on its native heath the 'Black Hand' was organized for good," explaining further: "An Italian who wrongs a woman, and fails to right the wrong, is practically driven from among his fellows. The black hand of ostracism is raised against him.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The 'Black Hand' in this country, brought into being for noble purposes across the sea, was prostituted and converted to ignoble purposes when transplanted to the United States." The "Black Hand" has scarcely even been heard of in Italy. It was never heard of until long after the term had been used in the United States, and then only as a distant manifestation of criminal activity regrettable because the good name of the Italians in the New World suffered by it. A society for the protection of women would be superfluous in Italy.

The name "Black Hand" is of Spanish origin, and the organization to which it referred was first described in 1889 by Major Arthur G. F. Griffiths, the English criminologist, in his work "Mysteries of Police and Crime." He wrote:

"Not so very long since a wide-spread organization for evil was brought to light in Spain—the Society of the Black Hand, as it was called. In its origin, it consisted of missionaries who hoped to redress the balance between rich and poor; but it soon drew down to it many desperadoes who gladly accepted the openings it offered for carrying on their original trade. It became a very extensive and numerous society, existing in the provinces, each having its own centre and out branches, with a total of affiliated members exceeding 40,000."

In the United States, the "Black Hand Society" is a myth, in so far as the phrase conveys the impression that an organization of Italian criminals exists in America, or that the Camorra or the Mafia has become naturalized here. By reason of the laxity of the immigration laws, there have crept into this country some thousands of ex-convicts from Naples, Sicily and Calabria, along with millions of honest and industrious Italians; and, owing to the inefficiency of the police in various cities where these Italians are domiciled, the criminals among them are able to live by robbery and extortion, frequently accompanied by murder, their victims being the more helpless of their fellow countrymen.

These fugitives from justice and gallows-birds, from whom it is America's duty to protect the law-abiding Italians who are doing yeoman service in the building of the Republic, are members of the Italian race that have brought disgrace upon the others, and upon whom the sensational press has conferred the title of "Black Hand Society." How many of these criminals there are in the United States it is impossible, for obvious reasons, to estimate with any degree of accuracy. Lieutenant Petrosino, who is in charge of the little Italian Squad in the Police De-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

partment of New York and probably knows more about the predatory brotherhood than any one else, says that they may number as many as from three to four per cent. of the Italian population. They are no more organized, however, than are the many thousands of lawbreakers of other nationalities in America. Indeed, Robert Louis Stevenson's playful but accurate characterization of the gangs of thieves that preyed upon nocturnal Paris three and a half centuries ago applies to the so-called "Black Hand" to-day—"independent malefactors, socially intimate, and occasionally joining together for some serious operation, just as modern stock-jobbers form a syndicate for an important loan."

Italian outlaws are enabled to reach this country to-day with almost the same facility as the honest Italian, so far as the laws of the United States are concerned. True, the ex-convict cannot obtain a passport from the Italian Government and sail on an Italian ship, but there is nothing to prevent his crossing the frontier and leaving from any port outside of Italy to which he may make his way. Many of the most dangerous of the Italian criminals in the United States have come here by way of England and Canada, and many others have shipped as sailors from Italian ports and deserted their ships on reaching this country.

The Neapolitan, Sicilian or Calabrian desperado, once he has reached these shores, finds the conditions ideal for levying tribute upon the feebler folk among his countrymen. In nearly all the larger cities, particularly of the East and Middle West, he will find them living in colonies by themselves. Besides the 500,000 Italians in New York, there are 100,000 each in Boston and Philadelphia; 70,000 each in San Francisco and New Orleans; 60,000 in Chicago; 25,000 each in Denver and Pittsburg; and 20,000 in Baltimore. In smaller cities are colonies that will number from 5,000 to 10,000.

Conditions are much the same in these colonies all over the country. They are generally located in a poor quarter of the town, which is not policed as well as those where the native American lives. The newcomers, moreover, are timid in their strange surroundings; they are ignorant of the law of the land; few of them can speak English, even if they dared to complain of outrages perpetrated upon them. And, when the humble and respectable Italians do appeal to the police and find that the law cannot, or will not, protect them, they are reduced to a pitiful

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

extremity that has driven scores of potential citizens back to Italy, kept many an industrious resident in actual bondage to the lawbreakers, and in some instances even forced hitherto honest men to become criminals themselves.

Aside from the urban Italians, there are some 500,000 laborers of the race distributed throughout the United States, working in mines and vineyards and on railroads, irrigation ditches and farms, who are equally victims of their rapacious countrymen with the dwellers in cities. In fact, there is scarcely a point throughout the length and breadth of the country where a few Italians are gathered together that some criminals of the race have not fastened themselves upon them.

Every reader of the newspapers is familiar with the outrages that, in the name of the "Black Hand," have been perpetrated among the Italians, beginning some ten years ago and increasing coincidentally with the Italian immigration, but reaching a limit two or three years ago. Murder has been a common crime, and the dynamiting of houses and shops, the kidnapping of children, with every species of blackmail and extortion, was of so frequent occurrence that the mind became dulled to the enormity of these offences. In New York conditions have been worse than anywhere else; and yet, with half a million of Italians in the population, there are to-day only forty Italians in the Police Department. Along miles of street in New York there are no guardians of the people who understand the language of the residents. As Marion Crawford says, the employment of Irish policemen in Rome would be an analogous circumstance, since there are more Italians in New York than in the capital of Italy.

How little the police have understood the situation may be gathered from the fact that, during the height of the wave of Italian crime three years ago, respectable members of that race were not allowed permits to carry weapons of defence, even when their lives were threatened. Physicians whose nocturnal duties subjected them to particular peril; bankers and business men, at any time liable to the attentions of scoundrels who did not stop at murder; in fact, all persons with Italian names were prohibited absolutely from carrying arms. Wherefore the police aided and abetted the outlaws, all of whom carried knives and pistols, by making it impossible for the law-abiding Italian legally to prepare for defence in case of attack.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

During twenty-nine years of residence in New York, I have found two causes that operate for the blackening of the Italian name in respect of crime: the sensationalism of the yellow press and the ignorance and recklessness of the police in recording arrests. Almost every dark-skinned European, not speaking English, who does not wear the Turkish fez, is put down on the police records as an Italian, and thus the Italian is condemned for much of the crime committed here by persons of other nationalities.

It is impossible to comprehend the attitude of a part of the American press with regard to the Italian, unless the theory is accepted that the truth is a consideration secondary to the publication of sensations that are calculated to increase the day's sales. Last spring, for instance, the newspapers manufactured a "Black Hand" scare, representing that the police were in despair of getting the lawless element under control. Two of the less sensational of the Sunday supplements had articles on the same day devoted to the subject, in each of which it was stated that an organization of Italian criminals under the name of the "Black Hand Society" existed in New York, and that it was growing in power so rapidly as to be an actual menace to the city.

One monthly magazine even published an alarmist article, actually signed with the name of Petrosino, the chief of the Italian Squad of the Police Department, entitled "Italian Mafia Has New York by the Throat," expressing views not held by the detective, who had never even heard of the article until it was shown to him in print. As a matter of fact, any reporter or writer who had made enquiries of Petrosino would have been informed that he was more encouraged than ever before to believe that he was at that very time bringing the Italian criminals under control.

A cruel bit of journalistic work that actually brought about fatal results came under my personal observation just after the assassination of King Humbert of Italy, in 1900, by the Italian anarchist Bresci, who had lived in Paterson up to a short time before the crime was committed. Newspaper reporters were swarming to New Jersey at that time, and one of them caught sight, in a barber shop in Hoboken, of the photograph of a well-known Italian merchant named Bianchetti, taken as he was saying farewell to some friends on board a steamer about to sail for Europe. The proprietor of the shop jokingly told this reporter

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the man in the photograph was Bresci, whereupon the news-seeker bought it. I personally informed him that the photograph was that of a highly respected citizen of Hoboken and I gave his name. Nevertheless, the picture was published in a New York newspaper that afternoon, and afterward copied in the Italian newspapers, not only in America, but in Italy, the result being that many of Bianchetti's acquaintances, in the Mother Country as well as in the United States, believed that he was in some way involved in the assassination of the King. He died of a broken heart within a year.

The term "Black Hand" was first used in this country about ten years ago, probably by some Italian desperado who had heard of the exploits of the Spanish society, and considered the combination of words to be high-sounding and terror-inspiring. One or two crimes committed under the symbol gave it a vogue among the rapacious brotherhood; and, as it looked well and attracted attention in their headlines, the newspapers finally applied it to all crimes committed by the Italian banditti in the United States. Thus the press not only facilitates the commission of crime among the Italian ex-convicts, by making it appear that all the evil done by them is the successful work of a single organization, that aids the individual criminal by leading his ignorant countrymen, upon whom he preys, to believe that he makes his lawless demands on behalf of a powerful society.

In spite of the depredations of the thousands of Italian criminals whom this Government has allowed to enter the country and prey upon the honest and industrious of their own race here, the great body of that race has prospered. A quarter of a century ago, there were not more than 25,000 Italians in America, and their entire possessions would have been valued at a trifling sum. To-day, in New York alone, the estimated material value of the property in the Italian colonies is $120,000,000, aside from $100,000,000 invested by Italians in wholesale commerce, $50,000,000 in real estate, and $20,000,000 on deposit in the banks. I doubt whether any other nationality can show as good a record of twenty-five years of achievement.

Of the Italian as a good citizen, a valuable member of society, I may not write, but perhaps I may be allowed to quote the opinion of an American of Anglo-Saxon descent, James J. Starrow, of Boston. Mr. Starrow writes:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"I believe the average Italian immigrant in physique the superior of the native New-Englander, and what other consideration is of more importance to us, or more surely lies at the base of a strong and vigorous race? The love of family is strong among Italians. What is more fundamental than this? The whole structure of modern civilization is based on the family group. If this goes to pieces, what matters it what the form of our Government may be? Can the native population point to any superlatively superior record in this respect? While the Italians consume a good deal of light wine, and occasionally too much, yet they are on the whole a very temperate race. The Italian drunkard hardly exists. Most important of all, the Italian women do not get drunk. The Italian seems to have a natural courtesy, which is not a mere surface indication, but, I think, springs, as all true courtesy does, from a certain affability of soul and regard for others."

In the United States, as everywhere, the Italian women are notably domestic. They are attached to home and family, and that tie they never break. They are never heard of in the divorce courts, and the President is not compelled to scold them about race suicide. Petrosino tells me that he has never seen an Italian woman "on the streets" in New York.

In the domestic life the Italian woman is at her best. She is a true helpmeet to her husband; she works hard to help him, and saves for him, as, I think I may say, no woman of any other race does. It is due to her that the Italians in this country are growing so rapidly in wealth. It is due to her that the name of Italy is not associated with any suggestion of social vice in the Western World. While she retains her Old World ways she brings up her children as good and sound Americans, inculcating upon their minds the principles of thrift and economy which she herself learned in Italy.

Immigration into this country now averages about 100,000 per month the year round. Of these newcomers one in every five is from Southern Italy; and, as I have said, criminals are still coming in. The investigation made in Europe last summer by the Congressional Immigration Commission that reports to the present Congress ought to result in a law deporting all foreign ex-convicts in the United States, who cannot prove that they are making an honest livelihood, and establishing some form of consular inspection on the other side to prevent any more of the criminal class from entering.

GAETANO D'AMATO.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A REVIEW OF THE TESTIMONY IN THE BROWNSVILLE INVESTIGATION.

BY JOSEPH BENSON FORAKER, UNITED STATES SENATOR.

It is difficult to review in a brief way the thousands of pages of testimony of witnesses and the many documents which make up the record of the arduous work performed by the Senate Committee investigating the Brownsville affray; but there have been so many misrepresentations and misunderstandings that it may be well, for the benefit of the public interested in the matter and uncertain of the conclusions, to set forth a few of the leading points which were established beyond doubt by the testimony.

It was near midnight, on the night of August 13-14, 1906, that the shooting occurred in the town of Brownsville, Texas. One private citizen, a barkeeper, was killed, a lieutenant of the police was wounded and his horse shot under him, and another citizen, editor of a Spanish newspaper, claimed to have been slightly injured.

Companies B, C and D, of the Twenty-fifth United States Infantry, colored, were at the time stationed at Fort Brown. The testimony taken shows that the record of each company, down to the time of the shooting, was without any kind of stain or blemish, and that all of the officers were of high character, not only as officers of the army, but as men; that they were honorable, upright, truthful and trustworthy in every sense. The official reports of the War Department have record of two or three difficulties, of one kind or another, occurring during the forty years of service since the Twenty-fifth Infantry was organized; but it was other companies of the regiment which were identified with the troubles in every case, and not one of the three companies stationed at Brownsville has a single blot upon its record. No company in all the army has a clearer and better record for dis-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cipline and general conduct. Almost all the men of the three companies had served more than one enlistment. Their terms of service ranged all the way from five or six years up to more than twenty years. Sergeant Mingo Sanders, of Company B, had served continuously for twenty-six years; and, counting double-time allowance for service outside of the United States, in eighteen months he would have been entitled to retire on three-quarters pay, with all the rights and allowances provided by law for men who have served continuously for thirty years. He would not willingly have sacrificed this opportunity. These three companies had been with the rest of the regiment at Fort Niobrara, Nebraska, for several years prior to going to Brownsville, and they only arrived at Fort Brown on Saturday, July 28th, two weeks and two days before the shooting occurred. Even the police of Brownsville testified to their good behavior and orderly conduct during that brief period.

A battalion of white soldiers had been stationed at Fort Brown. The announcement of the change was made several months in advance, and there is a great preponderance of evidence that the people of Brownsville resented it. A great deal was said by the newspapers about discrimination against the negroes by the saloons of Brownsville, but many of them—those kept by the Mexicans, and others—did not discriminate at all; and there is no testimony whatever to show that the soldiers resented it or made any effort to go where they were discriminated against. During their brief stay, there had been three altercations with citizens of Brownsville, only two of sufficient importance even to mention; and the most careful testimony elicited concerning them only showed the animus of the citizens and a reason why they might have attacked the soldiers, but none whatever why the soldiers should attack the citizens.

Brownsville is situated on the Rio Grande, with a population of about eight thousand, five-sixths of it Mexican. Like all frontier towns, it has had its fair share—if not more—of one kind or another of violators of the law. There was abundant testimony that, prior to the arrival of the colored troops, there were many ugly expressions—among them numerous threats of violence, coupled with assertions that "the negro troops would not stay long, if they did come," that "they would soon get rid of them," etc. On Monday, August 13th, a story was circulated

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

about the town concerning an alleged assault on a woman by a negro soldier, which caused such excitement that the mayor called upon Major Penrose, in the afternoon, advising him to keep the men in quarters that night, as they might be harshly dealt with by the citizens if found in the town. Mayor Combe's testimony before the committee showed clearly that the citizens were in a mood to "shoot up" the soldiers, but there was no evidence that the soldiers had ever thought of such a thing as "shooting up" the town. On the contrary, all the testimony concerning the three altercations which did occur shows that when the soldier, Newton, was knocked down with a revolver he made no resistance; that when Private Reed was pushed off a gang-plank into the water, and reported the matter to his captain, he laughingly remarked that he "guessed he got about what he deserved"; and that while Adair, the third soldier, was not in the least at fault, he made no complaint and showed no resentment. These three men all belonged to Company C, and are all shown, beyond any possible doubt, not to have participated in any way in the shooting affray. In fact, the strongest of all the testimony showed that no one belonging to Company C could have taken part in the trouble; and there was no one connected with companies B and D who had had trouble with anybody in Brownsville. Hence there is an absence of adequate motive for any of the soldiers to have engaged in such a raid.

There were two men better able than any others to give reliable testimony as to where the shooting began. They were the sentinel on duty at the fort, and a Mexican citizen of Brownsville who was acting as scavenger for the reservation, and at work when the firing began. They were wide awake, and have given intelligent and straightforward testimony. The sentry testified that when he heard the first shots he went between barracks C and B to a point on the walk, and fired his piece three times into the air for the purpose of giving the alarm. He asserts that there were no shots fired from within the walls except the three which he fired himself. The scavenger testified that the first shots were fired from some place near the mouth of Cowen Alley, quite outside the reservation. It is wholly probable that the desultory testimony tending to establish the fact that shots were fired from within the reservation all refers to the three shots fired by the sentry.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The call to arms was sounded immediately after the first shots were fired, and Companies B and D were formed while the firing continued. Company C was not formed till five or ten minutes after it ceased, owing to difficulty in getting their guns, because a non-commissioned officer in charge of quarters refused to unlock the racks without an order; so Major Penrose had them broken open and the men fell into line. The officers testified that, while it was possible that men engaged in the shooting might have rejoined companies before verification was complete, they were all of the opinion that none did so join.

A committee of citizens was organized the next day to investigate the matter, and testimony reported stenographically was taken by them, as complete as possible, while every incident was fresh in the minds of all. The record shows that the committee proceeded and witnesses testified entirely on the assumption that the firing was the work of the soldiers, and the only inquiry was as to which of the soldiers were guilty. Not one of all the witnesses called before this committee could say more than that, hearing the shots, they looked out into a very dark night and saw a party of men who appeared to be uniformed and armed like soldiers, and that on this account they recognized them as soldiers. It does not seem to have occurred to any one to investigate upon the possibility that some of the citizens of Brownsville might have "shot up" their own town, or that it might have been done by any but the soldiers, for perfectly obvious and plausible reasons and evident motives. The case was presented to the Grand Jury of Cameron County, of which Brownsville is the county-seat, with the result that, after three weeks of investigating, they found no testimony upon which to base an indictment of anybody. No one will pretend that, in all the three thousand pages of testimony taken by the Senate Committee, there has been one iota of evidence added to strengthen a case against any of these men.

The officers of the battalion supposed at the time of the shooting that it was done by citizens. They thought so until Mayor Combe came to the fort and charged that it was done by soldiers. Even then they refused to believe the charge till the mayor returned with some exploded shells and cartridges and clips, such as were used by men of the battalion. On the strength of this they concluded that some of their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

men must have done the firing, and they remained of this opinion till other facts were brought out, when Major Penrose and all of his officers returned to the conviction that the men of the battalion had nothing whatever to do with the shooting, and all of them so testified, under oath.

Major Blockson and Assistant Attorney-General Purdy were sent to Brownsville by the President to take further *ex parte* testimony. Doubtless, their reports as to what, in their opinion, the testimony established had more to do than the testimony itself in creating in the mind of the President the belief upon which he acted; for the Secretary of War and the President seemed satisfied that it had been established that certain soldiers of the battalion did the shooting, and that probably many others had knowledge of the guilty parties—in spite of the fact that every soldier of the battalion had stated, under oath, that he had had no participation whatever in the shooting and no knowledge whatever as to who did it; that, after the diligent inquiries of the officers of the battalion, not a clue had been found indicating that any one in the battalion had participated; that all of the men were present or accounted for in response to the call to arms, which sounded while the shooting was in progress; that as soon as it was light enough, the guns were inspected, and not one showed signs of having been fired the night before; that the ammunition was verified and every cartridge accounted for, not a single one was missing. It was found that the raiders were soldiers from the garrison, and the impossibility of their having kept their identity from their comrades was construed into a "conspiracy of silence," and all of the three companies were discharged from the army without honor and deprived of the privilege of re-enlistment.

The great difficulty with the early investigations was that they all proceeded on the supposition that the soldiers were guilty. Everything in favor of the soldiers was minimized. Everything against them was magnified. Major Blockson began his report with the unqualified statement that the trouble was caused by the soldiers of the Twenty-fifth Infantry. He stated that there was no doubt that the woman assaulted was seized by the hair and thrown to the ground by a tall negro soldier—though down to the present moment there has not been a word of sworn testimony to substantiate the statement; that he

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was sure the three shots which went through Mr. Yturria's house were fired from near the centre of B Company's upper back porch, etc.

When the evidence upon which these statements were made was carefully investigated, it was found insufficient to warrant the conclusions. In his testimony before the committee, General Garlington admitted that he entered upon his investigation assuming that the men were guilty, and that all he did was for the purpose of disclosing who the guilty soldiers were. At no time did it occur to him that any but the soldiers could have done it. If it were necessary to speculate beyond the question of the guilt of the soldiers, there are several suggestions which might be made as to others, with possible motives, who may have "shot up" the town.

But restricting ourselves to a review of the testimony against the soldiers, its inadequacy is clearly apparent. The night was unusually dark, yet the distances at which the eye-witnesses saw what they testified to, and recognized the raiders as colored soldiers, was all the way from thirty to one hundred and fifty feet, and in only one or two cases was there any possibility of artificial light. Experiments were made by officers of other companies, with the result, as testified to the committee, that from ten to fifteen feet away was as far as it was possible to distinguish their own men. This is an experiment which it is easy for any one to make. Simply try to recognize individuals or their clothing, or determine whether they are white or black on a dark night, from thirty to one hundred and fifty feet away, without any artificial light, and you will be instantly convinced that all of this evidence is utterly without value.

Other testimony, which of itself might have been pertinent, upon careful consideration became worse than worthless. Preciado, for example, testified the first time in a way that, if he had been supported, might easily have fixed the blame on the soldiers. But he changed his testimony entirely when under oath before the Grand Jury. He said then: "I could not see anybody in the alley, as it was dark out there and I was in the light. I heard no word spoken." A third statement, different from either, he published in his paper. It was finally and conclusively contradicted when one of the bullets fired in the volley

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he describes was bored out of a post by Lieutenant Leckie, and found to be of different composition from any of the bullets used by the soldiers, and one they could not have fired from their rifles.

Major Blockson's report that the course of the bullets which struck certain houses indicated that they had been fired from the upper balcony of B barracks was flatly contradicted by Lieutenant Leckie, who was sent by General McCaskey to Brownsville to investigate this and other matters for the Penrose court-martial. He testified that the bullets *could not* have been fired from B barracks.

A lot of exploded cartridge-shells, some clips and cartridges picked up in the streets of Brownsville and brought to the fort the next morning caused the officers of the battalion to conclude that the shooting was the work of the soldiers. But, when the evidence was thoroughly investigated, including a microscopic examination of the exploded shells, they became fully convinced that the men were innocent. In other words, the first and only evidence which had led them to think that the men were guilty eventually proved conclusively to these officers, who were best of all capable of coming at the truth, that the men were innocent.

There were many suggestive sidelights upon this point brought out in the committee investigation which had great weight. There were two or three hundred shots fired in Brownsville that night according to the testimony, but all of the ammunition of the battalion was accounted for afterward, and only about forty exploded shells were found in the town and produced in evidence. Other shells, to a large number, must have been exploded and left about the streets, and there was no reason why they should not have been found. It is only reasonable to suppose that, as they would not aid to convict the soldiers, not being such as the soldier could have used, they were not produced in evidence. No shell or clip or evidence of any kind was found inside the reservation wall. At daybreak the next morning Captain Macklin found, outside the wall across the street, at the mouth of Cowen Alley, seven shells and six clips on a circular area not more than ten inches in diameter. If these shells had been fired from one of the soldiers' rifles, they would have been scattered over an area of some ten feet

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in diameter. They could not have fallen as they were found; while the six clips found with them would have held thirty instead of only seven cartridges. The exploded shells were subjected to microscopic examination by order of the War Department; and, by peculiar indentations, it was determined beyond doubt that they must have been fired from four certain guns belonging to Company B; that some of the shells had failed fire once, and been returned to the rifle and fired on second trial; that nine of them bore evidence of having been twice inserted in the rifle, though with only one attempt to fire.

This testimony, which was thought for a time to show the guilt of the men, conclusively proved their innocence. One of the four guns—one from which certain of the exploded shells *must* have been fired—was shown by unimpeachable and uncontradicted evidence to have been lying, on the night of the affray, in an arm-chest in which it had been brought from Fort Niobrara, with the name of the soldier to whom it had been allotted on a slip of paper in the bore. The top of the chest was screwed down. The chest was in the store-room under a pile of baggage, and the door was locked. The gun had not been used since it was fired on the target-range at Fort Niobrara. It could not possibly have been fired at Brownsville. The shells with which it was identified *must,* therefore, have been fired on the target-range at Fort Niobrara. That the shells picked up in the streets of Brownsville were not fired there was conclusively shown through the microscopic inspection and in other ways.

The guns were new at Fort Niobrara, and were so heavily oiled with cosmoline that the action of the spring was impeded, and it was of frequent occurrence during their first use there that the cartridge failed to explode the first time and was picked up and inserted again. This difficulty was entirely overcome long before coming to Fort Brown.

It was also testified by the officers that on the rifle-range at Fort Niobrara, and only there, to their knowledge, could there have been any excuse for removing a cartridge without an attempt to fire. When the call to cease firing was sounded on the range every soldier was required to remove any unexploded cartridge from his rifle. This alone would cause the marks on the cartridge, showing that they had been twice inserted with but one attempt to fire.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Neither of these things could have occurred that night at Brownsville. If for any possible reason a cartridge had been expelled from the rifle unfired it would have fallen anywhere several feet away, and the idea is utterly untenable that on such a night and on such business a raider would have taken the time and trouble to hunt it up and reinsert it. It follows, therefore, that if the shells picked up in Brownsville were fired from certain rifles, as the microscopic investigation by the Government proved,—rifles belonging to the colored battalion,—they could not have been fired in Brownsville or later than the target practice at Fort Niobrara. But the presence of those shells in the streets of Brownsville, which had not been fired there, is suggestively accounted for by the fact that Company B took with it to Brownsville, as a part of its baggage, a box of exploded shells and a proportionate number of clips, and that this box stood open on the back porch of B barracks, where any one in passing could have helped himself.

The conclusion seems inevitable that the shells were found in the streets of Brownsville because some one, for some purpose, had taken them from the box and scattered them there on the night of the raid. Surely the soldiers would not have done this. Hence even the microscopic investigation by the War Department shows conclusively, not that the soldiers were guilty, but that they were innocent.

To find men guilty upon the evidence secured is to disregard, to violate and to reverse every recognized rule for weighing evidence. It is not only to hold these men as murderers and perjurers, but to assert that Major Penrose and all his officers, than whom there are none in the army more honorable, upright and reliable, were not worthy of credence when they testified under oath that they believed their men had told the truth and were entirely innocent. There is no ground whatever on which to justify such monstrous conclusions.

JOSEPH B. FORAKER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEW IRELAND.—II.

A GENERAL SURVEY.

BY SYDNEY BROOKS.

A COUNTRY and a people with such a history as I have sketched must needs be abnormal. Most of the evils that have afflicted Ireland may, indeed, be paralleled, one by one, in the case of other nations; but in Ireland alone have they operated in conjunction and simultaneously, or with only so brief a break in their consecutive malignity as gave neither time nor opportunity for recovery or escape. There is no one cause, just as there is no one remedy, for Irish ills. Geographical isolation and an enforced national exclusiveness need not in themselves have differentiated Ireland any more, for instance, than they have differentiated Norway. Other countries have been as bitterly torn by the clash of racial strife. The vitality of tribalism in Ireland finds an even exaggerated counterpart in the persistence of the clan system in the Scottish Highlands. Conquest, followed by the eviction of the natives from the soil and by their social, legal and political repression, has been one of the most common phenomena of European history. A soft and sensuous climate, a lack of mineral resources and a preponderance of pasture have not prevented other lands from developing an industrial spirit in prosperity and contentment. The commercial restrictions imposed upon Ireland in the eighteenth century were nothing exceptional. Religious persecution, though in Ireland it assumed the unique and peculiarly revolting form of the persecution of a majority by a minority, has ravaged nearly every Continental country for far longer periods and with immeasurably greater savagery. The drainage of emigration, the secular ascendancy of Catholicism, the instability of party government, inadequate education, a con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tinued stress of political agitation, an almost chronic scarcity among the masses, and the agricultural revolution wrought by Free Trade—not one of these is a factor peculiar to Ireland alone. It is their concurrence, the fatality of their combination in Ireland, the interplay of all of them at once or in breathless succession, that constitute the distinctive tragedy of Irish history. Had they come singly or at long intervals their effects might have been thrown off. Coming, as they did, in close-pressed and devastating battalions, with little or no chance for the recuperative principle to resist their convergent sweep, they have infected the whole body politic and left a penetrating mark, not only upon the structure of Irish society, but upon the character and mental instincts of the Irish people.

It is a commonplace of observation that there are two Irelands, and, as with most commonplaces, its significance is somewhat blunted by repetition. Not until one travels through the country, observing and cross-examining, does the phrase assume the meaning and proportions of a fact. There are, indeed, two Irelands, divided from each other by barrier upon barrier. It is not alone that three-fourths of the people are Roman Catholics, while the remainder belong to one or other of the Protestant sects. It is not alone that among the Catholics the Celtic strain has curiously persisted, while the Protestants approach more nearly the Lowland Scotch and the English types. It is not alone that Catholic Ireland, speaking broadly, is poor and agricultural, and Protestant Ireland prosperous and industrial, or that the majority feel themselves to be the true natives of the soil, while the minority still retain something of the spirit of a superior colonizing caste, or that there should lie between them seven centuries of social, religious and agrarian strife, or that on the master question of Irish politics they still irreconcilably differ. Not one of these elements of separation and contentiousness, taken by itself, would have sufficed to give the visitor his curious consciousness of passing in and out between two worlds, almost between two civilizations, each unintelligible and repugnant to the other. What makes up the full sum of the uniqueness of Ireland is that the factors of antagonism and discord, by the diabolical chance of history, coincide with and reinforce instead of cancelling each other. Class distinctions in Ireland are not mitigated by political agreement; differences of creed are not assuaged by a harmony

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of economic interests; the cleavages of racial temperament are not, as in other countries they are, bridged over by a sense of national unity. On the contrary, all the bitterness of caste and creed, of political and material antipathies and contrasts, instead of losing half their viciousness in a multiplicity of cross-currents, are gathered and rigidly compressed in Ireland into two incongruous channels. Throughout the country you infer a man's religion from his social position, his social position from his religion, and his views on all Irish questions from both. The inference, to be sure, is not invariably correct. There is still left a remnant of the old Catholic nobility and gentry whose political sympathies have nothing in common with those of the great bulk of their co-religionists. In Dublin, the "Castle" Catholic, the Catholic, that is, who has identified himself with the English system of government and with the social circle that centres on the Viceregal Lodge, is a common enough type; nor is it by any means the case that Catholic landlords have had less trouble with their tenants, or have been less exposed to agrarian outrage, than Protestants. The struggle for the land in Ireland has always evoked an intensity of feeling that has overridden the claims of religious and political communion, and the agitating Protestant tenant is as familiar in Ulster as the oppressive Catholic landlord in Kerry or Wexford. Nor is it here alone that the two Irelands cross and merge. There are several thousand Protestants in Ulster who are the stanchest and most determined of Home-Rulers. About a sixth of the Irish Nationalist Party at Westminster is composed of Protestants, and it is a remarkable and significant fact that, with the exception of O'Connell, nearly all the great leaders of the Irish nation during the past century and a quarter have belonged to the Church of the minority.

But, in spite of an overlapping at this point and at that, the two Irelands remain not deliberately, still less defiantly, but instinctively separate. The social and religious cleavage runs sheer down to the foundations. It is buttressed and perpetuated by the policy of the Catholic Church, and the Protestants, for their part, show no real inclination to break it down. The members of the two faiths are educated almost altogether apart; they may mingle in after-life in business or politics or the professions, but for all social purposes they retain a mutually exclusive aloofness; there is little bigotry, except in Londonderry and Belfast, but on the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other hand there is little intimacy. As a general rule, Protestants and Catholics in Ireland do not intervisit or hold any genuine intercourse together. In the social clubs, you will hardly find one member of the old faith to every score or fifty of the new; and that is not because sectarian intolerance penetrates further in Ireland than elsewhere, or even because the profession of the one creed or the other carries with it historical implications and significances of wider import than in any other land, but because the two sects are for the most part restricted to different social levels. Throughout Ireland the upper classes are all but exclusively Protestants. Their old political ascendancy has been torn from them, but their social and industrial supremacy remains. You soon come to take it for granted, when passing from one village to another, that the "big house" of the neighborhood is owned by a Protestant. You soon learn to be surprised, on making the circuit of the towns, if you find a single one of the principal industries in Catholic hands. The small tradesman, the retail shopkeeper, may be a Catholic; but the large manufacturer, the bank manager, the railway director, the shipbuilder, ninety-nine times out of a hundred, is a Protestant. And, whether in town or country, the Protestants form inevitably an aloof and self-contained coterie of their own, feeling themselves in character, education, culture and enterprise the members of both a superior class and a superior civilization. The upper classes among them, the landlords and the gentry, distinguished beyond any other body of men by the numbers of their titles, whose origin the tactful visitor will refrain from inquiring into, hardly regard themselves as Irish at all. Their eyes are turned Englandwards; they speak of "the people," even when with the utmost kindliness, much as an Indian civil servant might speak of the natives around him; they carry with them the consciousness of an eternal separateness; they have chosen, in short, to be English instead of Irish and Imperialists instead of Nationalists. For that choice they will stand eternally condemned by history, but history will also remember that few classes of men have ever developed a more winning or virile type of character, or have produced a greater number of gifted soldiers and administrators. As an aristocracy, they must be held to have failed, to have failed so badly that they have had to be bought out; but as individuals among a leader-loving people they have still, if they will only

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

seize it, a part of immense utility and beneficence to play in Irish life. Their relations with those about and below them, while frequently marked with a great outward friendliness and sympathy and much charitable zeal, lack altogether those amenities, that basis of mutual attachment, that placid revolution round the feudal centre, which have been the strength of the English squirearchy. Throughout rural Ireland, the sense of common interests between class and class seems almost to have perished. And, even among the great manufacturers of the North, all of whom, without, so far as I know, a single exception, are Protestants, one finds the same aggressive aloofness. Trade, as a rule, is a potent antiseptic to mitigate the poison of political and sectarian feuds; but fate has so willed it that the magnificent industries of Londonderry and Belfast should find in Ireland their workshop but not their market. Their business is almost altogether an exporting one, and this unquestionably has been a factor of considerable moment in preventing a true understanding between North and South, and in keeping the two classes, races and creeds apart. One comes at last to accept it as almost normal that Protestants and Catholics, when they meet at all in Ireland, should do so in one or other of the innumerable relations of employer and employed. There is, of course, the exception of sport, and especially of such sports as have to do with horseflesh. What the Irishman does not know about horses is hidden even from the Afghan or the New-Englander, and in the buying, selling, training, racing and hunting of horses there is probably more unforced mingling of the classes and creeds than in all other connections put together.

But while in Ireland the Protestants, though numbering only a quarter of the population, are thus socially, territorially and industrially in the ascendant, their political power has been whittled down to almost nothing. Of the 103 members who represent Ireland in the House of Commons, only 20 are Unionists—and Unionists and Protestants, with the deductions I have already touched on, are roughly synonymous. There are thirty-three county councils in Ireland. In fourteen of them the Unionists have not a single representative; in eight they have only one apiece; in twenty-seven, out of a total of 780 councillors, the Unionists are no more than 23; and in the whole thirty-three they are outnumbered by more than six to one. In the towns and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cities it is just the same. The whole machinery of local administration, in fact, outside Ulster, is in the hands of men whose chief claim to election is that they are Nationalists in sentiment, and who represent neither the wealth nor the experience nor the best brains and capacity of the country. The Unionists complain bitterly of their exclusion, but I cannot see what other fate they could possibly have expected. A majority long harassed and thwarted, often persecuted, always looked down upon, finds itself in sudden possession of political power. What can be more inevitable than that they should use that power against those who have oppressed them in the past, and who still retain most of the characteristics of an alien and dominant caste? An impartial student of Irish history can only, I think, marvel that the retribution should be so slight. Exclusion from nine-tenths of the local administration of the country is, after all, but a mild penalty for the numberless crimes committed against Irish well-being by the British "garrison." Human nature could hardly be satisfied with less; historical justice might well demand more. The local Nationalist bodies are indeed frequently grotesque enough. They pass the most flamboyant resolutions on matters with which they have not the least concern; their debates and their manner of conducting them are often uproariously comical; they "play politics" with a tireless assiduity; most of their appointments are friendly, good-natured "jobs," and they restrict the offices in their gift almost entirely to Catholics and Nationalists. But, when they can be induced to attend to their proper business, they carry it through with a quite adequate efficiency. Irish county government is no worse to-day under popular county councils than it was ten years ago under the old grand juries in which Protestants and Unionists almost exclusively predominated. There is no religious persecution; there is no discrimination in the matter of rates; the Irish peasant and the Irish farmer are even keener than most men in seeing that they get their money's worth; and the general ostracism of the upper classes is due not to their religious but to their social and political creed. I am persuaded that that ostracism is not a permanent condition. Many movements are at work to break it down; but, for the present, it is sufficiently effective to deprive the 250,000-odd Unionists in the three southern provinces of practically all share in both local and Parliamentary government.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is not, however, on any local issue, but on the penetrating problems of the land and of Home Rule, that the two Irelands part most decisively. The genius of Michael Davitt, by linking the agrarian question with the national question, the desire for more land with the desire for self-government, incalculably reinforced the intensity of both demands. No one can yet say positively whether the Irish agitation for autonomy is or is not a self-sufficing movement, or what vitality it will possess when deprived of the agrarian tumult and unrest which for thirty years and more have been its backbone. There is at present a peace in the country such as Ireland has not known for more than a century. Landlordism is being expropriated; a peasant proprietorship is being evolved; before another twenty years have passed the work of seven and a half centuries will have been undone, and the soil of Ireland will have been handed back to its original owners. So gigantic a revolution raises some profound and many-sided issues, and on these I propose to touch later on. For the present, I must content myself with a few general observations. The great scheme of land purchase which is now in operation will have settled, when completed, one question only, the land-tenure question. It has been the curse of Irish history that rent and ownership should hitherto have absorbed the agricultural energies of the country. How much could be got out of the land has been of little account compared with how little could be paid for it; and the concentration of both landlords and tenants upon the sole issue of rent has been morally and technically disastrous to true agricultural progress. That issue is now by way of being determined; the tenant, by the lavish help of State credit, is being converted into a freeholder. This means, of course, that the main source of internal strife is being dammed at the fountain-head. But it also means that the Irish peasant and the Irish farmer are brought for the first time face to face with the realities of a competitive agricultural existence, and that their well-being from now onwards depends on their own labor and efficiency. The policy of land purchase, in short, has cleared the ground, has laid the foundations of a new social order, has brought or is bringing a long and vitiating conflict to a close. But the restoration of agrarian peace, while an essential condition of agricultural prosperity, is very far from being prosperity itself; and, even if it were not complicated in Ireland by an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

infinity of cross-currents, it could not in the nature of things do more than provide an opportunity, an opportunity which it rests wholly with the people themselves to neglect and stultify or to make the most and best of. Nothing, therefore, could be more fantastic than to suppose that the mere transfer of title-deeds in the soil from landlord to tenant has induced, or by itself can ever induce, the Irish millennium. Moreover, it will take, as I have said, twenty years at the lowest estimate to complete the transfer itself. There are many landlords who have refused to sell under the Wyndham Act, and to these some form of compulsion will have to be applied. Again, in the barren and backward West, where the best land is given up to stock-raising and the peasants lead a life of appalling destitution on their wretched five-acre holdings of bog and stony moor, there is a fierce agitation for the partition of the grazing-lands. We have not, therefore, by any means seen the last of agrarian unrest and possibly of agrarian outrage in Ireland. The peace of which I have spoken is relative only. It may not again be broken in the old convulsive fashion, with the murders of landlords and their agents, the houghing of cattle, boycotting and arson, and an entire society thrust by every ingenious weapon of organized terrorism into a condition little short of anarchy. Ireland at large has advanced beyond that stage; but what is true of the country as a whole is not true of every section in it. Here and there, in this locality and in that, the "bad times" may be again reproduced on a smaller scale, in a more modified form, but with effects not less ruinous and demoralizing than of old.

More than any country I am acquainted with, more even than Poland itself, Ireland is a network of "organizations," leagues, societies, factions and cliques. Almost every department of life seems to be on a committee basis; individual action and individual opinion are everywhere marshalled in subservience to the interests of this movement or of that. There is, perhaps, no land in which there is more volubility of speech and less real liberty of thought than in Ireland. A genius for combination penetrates to the lowest strata, is indeed among the peasantry almost an instinct, and an instinct cultivated with more than Sicilian aptitude. The associative qualities innate in tribalism and fostered by centuries of repressive government and by the impulse of class and racial warfare have blossomed into a talent for con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

certed agitation such as even the most professional of American politicians might envy. Indeed, just as on its religious side Irish life to-day curiously suggests the Spain of three hundred years ago, so the scheme and spirit of Irish politics have the unmistakable flavor of modern America. The Irish emigrant to the United States is a graduate in all the arts of Tammany Hall before he lands; the rigging of conventions, the theory and practice of "pull," the whole science of manipulating opinion, he has learned and applied at home. But, whereas Tammany Hall confines itself mainly to politics, its essential principle takes on in Ireland a far wider sweep and embraces not only politics, but the land and the private and social as well as the public life of the people. Mr. Stephen Gwynn has even remarked that "it would be hardly too much to say that Catholics in Ireland form among themselves—without intention and even without knowledge—a huge secret society, like all secret societies amenable to a special code." There are villages and towns in Ireland by the score where the spirit of faction works much as it worked among Guelfs and Ghibellines and Montagus and Capulets, where the streets are apt at times to ring with the blows of contending rivalries, and where little or nothing is done or attempted without reference to the desires and susceptibilities of this or that group. And the whole field of politics, which through the intimacy of its connection with the land yields the people their main occupation, has been, I need hardly say, meticulously surveyed and parcelled out. The landlords, quite apart from the Orange Society in the North, have their own federations for mutual assistance, for providing, for instance, caretakers on farms from which the tenants have been evicted, for furnishing the sinews of war in the protection of their class interests, and for deluging England with lecturers, leaflets and peripatetic orators in support of Unionist principles. But, naturally, it is among the Nationalists and the farming classes that organization has been most developed. Such a body as the United Irish League, which has a branch in pretty nearly every town and village in the country, and works the whole machinery of political and agrarian agitation, is a far more effective power than the British Government, and its decrees command an obedience that is systematically refused to the King's writ. There are at least a dozen other organizations on a smaller scale, but of a similar

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

character, some purely political, some confined, in the main, to the interests of a section or a class—the town tenants, for example, or the agricultural laborers—some literary or athletic or industrial or "benevolent," but all strongly imbued with the sentiment of Nationalism, and all carrying on a vigorous propaganda. The strongest of them, of course, are those that are linked with the agrarian question; for, while Nationalism in Ireland is a sentiment, the land is life, and anything that touches the land touches also the mainspring of Irish existence. An eviction is still the signal for something in the nature of a local uprising; the "land-grabber" who rents a farm from which the previous tenant was expelled is still a marked man; and juries, unless carefully packed by the Crown, still refuse to convict any man who is charged with an agrarian outrage. The landlords are by no means the only, in these days are not even the chief, sufferers by the action of these various organizations. An unpopular member of a local branch of the United Irish League, or one who has offended the local trader and publican who, with the priest, dictates its policy, or one who has sinned against the unwritten agrarian code of the neighborhood, or who belongs to a faction that has fallen under the displeasure of another and more powerful faction, is just as likely to be boycotted and intimidated, to have his business ruined, his supplies cut off, his cattle maimed, his crops trampled, his buildings fired and his comings and goings attended by a mob blowing horns, as was ever a landlord or his agent in the worst days of the Land League. It is one of the first things to be realized about Ireland that coercion, in some form or other, is the rule of life, and that, as organized opinion in a country so torn with internal feuds is always extreme opinion, men of moderate views and peaceable inclinations are overborne and silenced. With but a slight variance of degree, this holds good for both Unionist and Nationalist Ireland, and opinion in Belfast and Portadown is scarcely less tyrannized over by the Orange Society than in Mayo or Galway by the United Irish League. "Terror and greed," I was told by the only impartial man I came across in Ireland, a priest, a Nationalist, yet a most candid and clear-eyed observer—"Terror and greed—those are the operative forces of Irish life and politics."

SYDNEY BROOKS.

(To be Continued.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CASTRO, THE UNGRATEFUL.

BY R. FLOYD CLARKE.

In December, 1902, the Chancelleries of Great Britain, Germany and Italy, after years spent in the tedious decorum of diplomatic correspondence calling to the attention of Venezuela the wrongs done to their respective citizens, and after Venezuela's refusal to arbitrate, proceeded to enforce those claims by bombarding and blockading the Venezuelan ports.

No sooner had the cannon thundered than the redoubtable Castro experienced a change of heart. For many years intrenched behind the interminable resources and tortuosities of Venezuelan diplomatic correspondence, he had successfully flouted and baffled the world. If high-flown protestations of morality and honor were proof of the existence of those qualities, then the Venezuelan portion of this correspondence proves Venezuela to have possessed these fine attributes to a marked degree. Curiously enough, in all her concessions Venezuela inserts a clause stipulating that no matter what infamy may be perpetrated upon the *concessionaire,* he shall never have recourse to international redress. This is known in International Law as the "No Reclamation Clause." It should be renamed the "Venezuelan Immunity Bath." The great nations have insisted that this clause, being against public policy, is not binding and no shield to any gross injustice. But to a Venezuelan diplomat nothing can be more outrageous than a discussion of the equity of the case, when the despoiled citizen of the foreign state has thus placed himself in Venezuela's hands.

Patience having reached its limit, even the formidable shield of the Monroe Doctrine, *plus* this Immunity Bath, could not prevent legitimate consequences. The blockade began and Venezuela, on her knees, begged for arbitration.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To those who are unfamiliar with Venezuelan conditions, it may seem a strange thing that the explosion of a few shells and the blockade of her ports should so quickly have brought the Venezuelan Government to terms. The "man in the street" predicted that nothing would be accomplished, as there was nothing to be harmed by bombardment, and no permanent occupation of the country could be attempted except at prohibitive cost of blood and treasure. Those who so figured the situation overlooked the peculiar nature of Venezuela's weakness. Because of a century of misgovernment she has no diversification of industries. To a large extent she depends for subsistence, even for the foodstuffs, such as flour, upon her imports, while her cattle exports are her main dependence. The revenues raised by taxation practically consist only of the import and export duties.

The Dictator can exist only by feeding and paying his army. Stop the customs dues and you drain the life-blood of Venezuela's political constitution. "No pay, no army, no Dictator" is the law of Venezuelan politics. The moment, therefore, that the allied Powers blockaded the Venezuelan ports Castro faced bankruptcy, and bankruptcy meant ruin for Castro.

Then ensued a situation as acute and undignified as anything outside of opera bouffe. Having, only a few days before, rebuffed and insulted the European Powers, who thus resorted to the Big Stick, the redoubtable Castro in effect abdicated responsibility. We find in the Venezuelan Yellow Book, under date of December 16th, 1902, a petition from eleven Venezuelan citizens requesting the Citizen-President Castro to give full powers to the United States Minister "to take the necessary steps to arrange the difficulty in the manner least prejudicial to the country."*

Then backed by the consent of the Hon. John Hay, United States Secretary of State, that he should act as intermediary for Venezuela, there sprang into prominence, in the person of Mr. Herbert W. Bowen, United States Minister in Venezuela, a kind of sovereignty hitherto unknown in the family of nations. Mr. Bowen's diplomatic notes to the allied Powers, speaking *ex cathedra* with all the authority of a sovereign, backed by unlimited armies and navies, caused ripples of merriment in the halls of the various Chancelleries; but they produced effects,

* Venezuelan Arbitrations of 1903, Ralston's Report, 1,032.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the Venezuelan Arbitrations of 1903 resulted. Undoubtedly, the majestic figure of Venezuela's mighty neighbor of the north waiting, portentous, in the background, absorbed in pious contemplation of the Monroe Doctrine, commanded some sort of vicarious respect for the fulminations of this temporary potentate and insured the results attained. At any rate, whatever Venezuela may have thought of her debt of gratitude at the time, those who know the physical truth that out of nothing comes nothing know that whatever need of consideration she then received at the hands of her outraged foes was due to the friendly offices of the Government of the United States.

That corporations have no souls is an axiom of the common law. Subsequent events appear to have proved that sovereignties, at least as exemplified in Cipriano Castro, President of Venezuela, have no souls or, at any rate, no gratitude. In the short space of the few years that have passed since the grievous hand of war was lifted from her coast through our intervention, Venezuela, in the person of Castro, has perpetrated acts of injustice and oppression against American citizens, so gross and so unwarranted as almost to surpass belief. Against these our State Department has repeatedly made strong remonstrances; and not merely once, but four times, has this Government categorically requested a submission to arbitration of these disputes, and as often has Cipriano Castro flatly and insolently refused arbitration. Of the five claims presented, that of the United States and Venezuela Company happens to be, both as to its facts and the law applicable, the clearest and simplest of all the claims of American citizens against Venezuela.

A short summary of the salient facts will suffice to show that the claim of the United States and Venezuela Company against Venezuela presents a clear case of spoliation by Venezuela without justification or excuse.

In 1900 some American gentlemen interested in paving matters, desiring to find an asphalt deposit equal to the celebrated Trinidad Lake, despatched to Mexico and Venezuela George W. Crichfield to explore and report. At a place called "Inciarte," about seventy miles to the westward of Maracaibo, Crichfield found a splendid asphalt lake. He contracted to purchase the mine from its Venezuelan owners and applied to Cipriano Castro, Provisional President, for a concession for a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

railroad, with the stipulation, without which the property was valueless, that the enterprise should be free from taxes.

On April 20th, 1901, in consideration of the payment of 50,000 bolivars and the building of a railroad, etc., which, at the end of fifty years, was to become the property of the Government, a concession was granted by Cipriano Castro, Provisional President of Venezuela, to George W. Crichfield. Thereby Crichfield was authorized to construct a railroad from the asphalt mine at Inciarte to navigable water on the banks of the River Limon, to dig canals and deepen and improve waterways, to use the railroad in connection with the mine mentioned, and to establish depots and warehouses, etc. It was further agreed that during the term of the concession, which was to last fifty years, the enterprise was to be exempt from all national taxes and contributions, including import and export duties.

Thereupon the purchase of the asphalt mine was completed. The United States and Venezuela Company was organized under the laws of New Jersey, and took over the concession and proceeded to develop the property.

The record of the company in Venezuela as an honest business enterprise is of the highest. Neither scandal nor bad faith is attached to it. The road was built through forests, swamps and almost impenetrable jungles. Through water and mud breast-deep, in the furnace-heat gloom of tropical forests, Crichfield and his assistant, David Fleming, fighting against malaria, insect pests peculiar to the country—whose attacks are intolerable and almost fatal in their effects,—the dread dengue and yellow fever, snakes and Indians, overcame almost insuperable difficulties, and pushed the road-bed and its bridges until a railroad connection was made between the mine and navigable water. It is a story of American grit, indomitable pluck and triumphant success. The River Limon was improved by blowing up rocks and removing trees. Across the bar at its mouth a canal more than one and a half miles long was dug. At its junction with the Sucuy a railway terminus was made, a refining-plant, saw-mill, residences and office-buildings were erected, and a village created. What was once a trackless wilderness was opened up for settlements, clearings were made, farms located, schools established, and churches built.

The company began manufacturing operations in August, 1902,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and, except during the 1903 blockade, manufactured and shipped asphalt up to the 20th day of January, 1905. Over $600,000 was spent in the purchase of the mine and the development of the property. The enterprise is worth not less than $1,500,000. The asphalt lake covers ninety-seven acres, and the deposit, of unknown and incalculable quantity, is almost inexhaustible. During the twelve months of 1904 the company earned a net profit of $84,119.57 or over five and one-half per cent. on its total capitalization of $1,500,000.

But the storm was brewing. On July 22nd, 1904, under color of judicial proceedings, Castro seized, through his receiver, Carner, the plant and property of the New York and Bermudez Company. Since that date the Venezuelan Government has practically been manufacturing asphalt and selling it in the United States on conditions under which the receiver is crediting to the owners of the property, under the court's decree, the ridiculous price of five dollars a ton—the balance of the profit going to an as yet judicially undiscovered beneficiary. Prior to this seizure of the Bermudez Lake the United States and Venezuela Company, as the owner of the Inciarte Asphalt Mine, and the New York and Bermudez Company, as the owner of the Bermudez Lake, had been in active competition throughout the United States. As soon as Castro thus entered the field, and the force of this competition was felt against the industry of his receiver, Mr. Carner, a very simple plan was devised whereby such competition should be eliminated. On January 23rd, 1904, a new Mining Code had been promulgated, under which a hectare tax of forty cents annually—four times the former tax—was imposed, and a further tax of "three per cent. on the gross product of the mine." On June 21st, 1904, by Executive Decree, a duty of four bolivars (eighty cents) was levied on every ton of asphalt exported, and a further provision was made that "the contractors must pay as a minimum to the Government of the Republic twenty-five per cent. of the net product of the exploitation of said mines."

Thereupon the Venezuelan Executive proceeded to enforce against the United States and Venezuela Company the increased hectare tax—the three-per-cent. tax on the gross product of the mine and the eighty-cents tax on each ton exported—the tax of twenty-five per cent. of the net product being left to future

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exploitation. In enforcing the three-per-cent. tax they valued the asphalt at twenty dollars per ton at the mine, the tax thus yielding sixty cents a ton. Note the difference between this figure and the five dollars per ton credited to the Bermudez Company in the receivership operations. In addition the Government levied the usual duties on imports and held them in the Custom House.

The company forthwith protested and, finding its protests unheeded, offered to pay the new taxes under protest until the matter could be settled. The only answer made was that all payments must be made, not only without protest, but with the express admission that the tax was properly imposed, and that, if the *concessionaire* had any grievance, it must go to the Venezuelan Courts.

The company's claim that its enterprise was free from these taxes was based on the twelfth and thirteenth articles of its concession, which read as follows:

"Article 12: Neither the enterprise to which this contract refers, nor the products of its mine, can be burdened with any kind of national taxes or contributions. . .

"Article 13: The contractor is allowed to enter free of import duties and free of any other tax through the Custom House of Maracaibo all the material for the construction of the road, rolling-stock, tools, machinery and all other things required for the working of the mines and the refining and transportation of their products."

Finding no relief, after various petitions and memorials to the Venezuelan Government against these illegal impositions—impositions which, under the penal clauses in the acts, would result, on the company's default, in putting it in the power of the Government to confiscate the mine and the railroad and to cancel the concession,—the company, in January, 1905, shut down its works and applied to the State Department of the United States of America for redress.

So far as known, it appears that no claim is made, on behalf of Venezuela, of any right thus to cancel this concession and put the company out of business, excepting a claim to the effect that, although this concession was granted by Cipriano Castro as Provisional President, the concession is invalid because not approved by the National Congress. As, in fact, Castro is a Military Dictator, ruling Venezuela as such under the masquerade of a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Constitutional Republic, this contention involves a grim joke—Castro, Dictator, so-called Constitutional President, repudiates Castro, Dictator, so-called Provisional President; Philip drunk, with the loot of 50,000 bolivars and a $600,000 railroad, repudiates Philip sober, whose fair promises and pretensions induced the investment.

The company, however, meets the contention on its alleged merits as follows:

First: If any Venezuelan Constitution applies, then its requirements have been fully complied with. On February 5th, 1902, the Venezuelan Congress passed a resolution whereby it was agreed:

"First: To give our approbation to all of the acts executed by the Citizen-General Cipriano Castro during the period in which he has exercised the provisional Presidency of the Republic."

Among the acts executed by Castro during this period was the concession thus granted to Crichfield and assigned, with Venezuela's consent, to the United States and Venezuela Company, on file in the public documents and archives.

Second: There was no Venezuelan Constitution in force in 1901 when this concession was granted. Castro's rebellion against Andrade was based on the claim that Andrade's constitution was contrary to the first principles of right and justice. Castro, as the Military Head of the successful revolution against Andrade, united and exercised in himself all executive, legislative and judicial powers, untrammelled by any constitution. No constitution was in existence until, in 1904, Castro's Constituent Assembly passed a new constitution. Meantime, on April 20th, 1901, this concession was granted, which provided that the contractor should begin work within six months and should complete it within one year after commencing it. According to this provision, the money was expended and the work completed before any new constitution was adopted. What stronger equitable estoppel against the insistence by the Government upon the technical legality of a Congressional approval could exist than this? How, then, could any constitution, new or old, affect the company?*

Castro, however, having entered into the business of manu-

* Michigan *vs.* Flint & Pere Marquette R. R. Co. (1891), 89, Michigan, p. 481.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

facturing and selling asphalt, imposed taxes which put his competitor, the United States and Venezuela Company, out of business. Had the company desired to pay the duties and go on, it could not do so, because the Government refused to accept payment under protest. Payment without protest would have waived the company's rights under the concession. Once concede the propriety under the concession of the new taxes imposed, and further exactions, at the discretion of the Dictator, would have followed without the possibility of the company's having a legal defence thereto.

Under such circumstances, is the American Government to stand by and allow its citizens to be thus despoiled without action? Powerful enough to crush in a moment the pigmy who perpetrates this injustice, its only reason for inaction seems to be the fear that the disparity of force, if it took action, would make this Government appear as a bully. It is time that the facts should be recognized and stated without mincing words.

The Government of Venezuela is not a government such as exists in our nations of more advanced civilization. Masquerading under a written constitution, whose provisions for balancing the powers of government and assuring freedom and procuring justice compare favorably with our own, we have a Military Dictatorship moulded and wielded in all its Departments, Executive, Judicial and Legislative, by one man of passionate character and sordid aims. The Venezuelan Constitution and Laws are mere bits of waste paper, fit to conjure with or disregard, as the convenience or interests of the Dictator may require.

Not many years ago several large American enterprises existed in Venezuela. With the sailing from Maracaibo last summer of David Fleming, Manager of the United States and Venezuela Company, the last American representative of an American enterprise departed those inhospitable shores. Each and all have been driven out by Government exactions—breaches of Governmental good faith.

To accord to such a sovereignty, whose moral perceptions are far below the standards of civilized nations, the presumption of honesty and good faith arising from equality of sovereignty—such as would be extended to nations of higher ethical standards, Germany or Great Britain, for instance—is to be misled by a legal fiction, and to blind ourselves to the glaring facts.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That Congress, therefore, should insist that the Executive enforce upon Venezuela the arbitration of these claims, even though to secure such arbitration the use of a "Mailed Fist" should be required, is demanded by every principle of right and justice, and by every consideration of self-respect. It is not the application of the Big Stick. For the United States does not (as it has the power to do) say, as Great Britain and Germany said in 1903: "Admit your liability and pay the damages the arbitrators assess." But it says: "Submit the issues involved to an impartial tribunal." What could be more fair? What more equitable? What more magnanimous?

And shall the mere fact that the offender, who thus denies redress in the premises is a weakling, prevent our Government from enforcing justice and right in the premises? The question answers itself. "*Civis Romanus sum*" was the passport and safeguard of the lives and property of the citizen of ancient Rome throughout the world. Let it be said of this great new Power that "*Civis Americanus sum*" shall likewise be a passport and a safeguard—at least throughout Latin-America, which exists only by virtue of our power and strength in upholding and enforcing the Monroe Doctrine.

In 1895 President Cleveland's message brought this country and Great Britain close to the verge of war. Over what? The insistence by the United States that Great Britain should arbitrate the disputed boundary between her colony and this same Venezuela. A country which forced the issue that international disputes must be settled by arbitration to a point threatening war between the two great English-speaking nations should not shrink from forcing the beneficiary of that interference into taking a dose of his own, at that time welcome, now not so palatable, medicine.

As we were bold enough then to beard the British Lion in defence of Venezuela against the suggestion of unfairness arising from the refusal of Great Britain to arbitrate the dispute between them, so now we should have sufficient constancy not to be deterred from forcing this petty potentate to arbitrate his dispute with us, merely because of possible criticism that we have misused the material power which is in us, to compel this fair result.

R. FLOYD CLARKE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HAS THE UNITED STATES REPUDIATED INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION? A REPLY.

BY F. D. MCKENNEY.

UNDER the terms of a protocol agreed upon and signed early in 1903, between the United States of America and the Republic of Venezuela, the claim of the Orinoco Steamship Company, an American corporation wholly owned by American stockholders, for the reparation of damages suffered by it as the result of specified wrongful acts and defaults on the part of the Venezuelan Government, was submitted for adjudication to an international arbitration commission which met and sat in Caracas. That commission consisted of two members—one appointed by the President of the United States, the other by the President of Venezuela, and an umpire named by the Queen of the Netherlands.

The protocol declared that "all claims *owned* by citizens of the United States of America against the Republic of Venezuela" which should be presented to the commission by the Department of State of the United States should be examined and decided by it, and required the commissioners and the umpire "before assuming the functions of their office" to "take solemn oath carefully to examine and impartially decide, *according to justice and the provisions of this convention,* all claims submitted to them." The particular provisions of the protocol or "convention" pertinent to this discussion are as follows:

> "The commissioners, or in case of their disagreement, the umpire, shall decide all claims upon a basis of absolute equity, without regard to objections of a technical nature, or of the provisions of local legislation.
>
> "The decisions of the commission, and, in the event of their disagreement, those of the umpire, shall be final and conclusive."

The claim of the Orinoco Steamship Company, as presented

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the commission by the Department of State, contained four items, of which the first, and perhaps the most important, was a claim for damages for the breach by the Venezuelan Government of a contract or concession in favor of the claimant's assignor for the exclusive right to navigate the Macareo and Pedernales channels of the Orinoco River with vessels engaged in foreign trade, plying between Trinidad and certain Venezuelan ports.

The second item was for the sum of 100,000 bolivars, about $20,000, admitted by an account stated and agreed upon between the authorized representatives of the Venezuelan Government and the claimant's assignor to be due from the former to the latter.

The third item covered various claims for damages inflicted upon and losses sustained by the claimant and its assignor by reason of the seizure, detention and use of certain vessels belonging to them, and for amounts due for services rendered by the claimant and its assignor to the Venezuelan Government on the latter's request, as evidenced by formal vouchers or receipts.

The fourth item consisted of a claim for counsel fees and expenses incurred by the steamship company in its various attempts to collect the amounts alleged to be due to it from Venezuela.

The whole of the first and second items, and the greater part of the third, arose prior to April 1st, 1902, during the corporate existence of claimant's assignor, the Orinoco Shipping and Trading Company, Limited, these items of demand having been assigned by that company on that date—together with its fleet of steamships and all its corporate franchises and assets, including lands, depots and stores both in Venezuela and elsewhere—to the Orinoco Steamship Company.

The Orinoco Shipping and Trading Company, Limited, which had been in existence for a number of years prior to 1902, was an English registered company; but ninety-nine per cent. of its capital shares were owned absolutely by the native-born American citizens who subsequently incorporated and organized, and still own, the entire capital stock of the Orinoco Steamship Company.

The interest of these American citizens in the Orinoco Shipping and Trading Company, Limited, and in the claims of that corporation against Venezuela had been made known officially to the Department of State of the United States early in the year 1899, and the incorporation of the Orinoco Steamship Company by such American citizens and the transfer to it of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all the assets of the English company, including said claims, were made known to said department as they occurred.

For some time prior to February 17th, 1903, the date of the protocol under consideration, these assigned claims had been the subject of diplomatic communication between the United States and the Government of Venezuela; and the existence of these assigned claims and the interest of the American company in them was well known to the representatives of both contracting Powers at the time of the execution and exchange of said protocol. It was for the accommodation and protection of these assigned claims and to secure an adjudication of them on their merits that the form of expression ordinarily used in such protocols in defining the matters to be arbitrated was abandoned, and the unusual phrase, "all claims *owned* by citizens of the United States of America against the Republic of Venezuela" was adopted in its stead.

That the Orinoco Steamship Company was a citizen of the United States within the intent of the protocol, and that it "owned," by virtue of a valid assignment, the claims against the Government of Venezuela now under consideration has never been denied nor disputed, and such was found to be the fact by the umpire, Dr. Harry Barge, who also solemnly found and declared that the commission over whose deliberations he was appointed to preside, and he as its umpire, had full jurisdiction under the express terms of said protocol to investigate and decide upon their respective merits each and every one of said claims. The commissioners of the contracting Powers disagreed with respect to the liability of Venezuela in the premises; and the decision of the claims was remitted to the umpire.

Notwithstanding all of the above, and notwithstanding the requirement of the solemn oath which he had taken, at the moment of qualifying as umpire, to examine and decide all claims submitted to him "according to justice and the provisions of this convention," Dr. Barge disallowed the first and second items *in toto* and the third in its greater part, because, primarily, as he states in his review of the case, the assignment by the Orinoco Shipping and Trading Company, Limited, of its valuable rights in the navigation of the Orinoco River and of its claims against Venezuela had been made without first notifying that country of its intention to make such transfer, and, secondarily, because

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

under a certain article of the concession of navigation the *concessionaire* had, in his view, pledged itself to submit all disputes and controversies which might arise out of it to the local tribunals of Venezuela for their decision.

Referring particularly to the cash item of 100,000 bolivars—which, by a written agreement made on May 10th, 1900, between Felix Quintero, Minister of the Interior, and R. Morgan Olcott, acting on behalf of the Orinoco Shipping and Trading Company, the Venezuelan Government bound itself to pay—the learned umpire declared that, under a certain provision of the code of law of Venezuela, the transfer of such a debt "gives no right against the debtor when it was not notified to or accepted by the debtor," and this provision he also held to be applicable to that portion of the third item, some $49,978.76 in amount, which was alleged to have accrued due prior to April 1st, 1902, the date of the assignment to the American company.

In this connection the judgment of the umpire reads as follows:

"Whereas . . . the transfer of the credits of the Orinoco Shipping and Trading Company, Limited, to claimant took place on the first of April of this same year [1902], it is clear from what heretofore was said about the transfer of these credits that all items of this claim based on obligations originated before said April 1st, 1902, and claimed by claimant as indebtedness to the company and transferred to claimant on said April 1st, have to be disallowed, as the transfer was never notified to or accepted by the Venezuelan Government."

The fourth item of the claim, being that for counsel fees, was disallowed because "the necessity to incur those fees and further expenses in consequence of an unlawful act or culpable negligence of the Venezuelan Government is not proved."

The sum of $28,224.93, which was a part of the third item and which was the sum awarded by the umpire to the claimant, was identical in character of origin and was supported by the same class of proof as was that portion of the same item which was rejected, but it was distinguished by the umpire from the latter because it had accrued due subsequent to the date of the assignment from the elder company to the claimant.

Does it not plainly appear that the respected umpire, in refusing to consider and decide the first three items upon their merits and on the evidence "furnished by or on behalf of" the United States, and in rejecting them all because the transfer from one company to the other, which transfer affected each one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of them, had not been previously "notified to or accepted by the Venezuelan Government" as required by the Venezuelan code of law, violated the express command of the protocol whose terms he was appointed to administer, and also violated the express requirement of his oath of office which obligated him to decide all matters in dispute in accord with the provisions of that "convention"? The failure or refusal of the umpire to determine the three items in accord with the express requirements of the protocol, "without regard to objections of a technical nature," and without reference to "the provisions of local legislation," has left them undetermined in fact, and has permitted them to remain and continue to be a source of international concern, as they were prior to the execution of the protocol under which it was the undoubted intention of both Governments that they should be examined and finally decided. Their merits not having been examined, and the items themselves having been rejected by the umpire solely upon technical grounds, or out of regard for the provisions of local legislation, how can it reasonably be said that the claim of the Orinoco Steamship Company has in fact been examined and decided by an international commission under an international agreement?

But it has been suggested that, by the terms of the protocol in question, it was agreed by the contracting Governments that the decisions of the commission, or of the umpire in case of their disagreement, should "be final and conclusive"; and it is further suggested that the insistence by the United States that the decision in the present case shall be revised and the case itself resubmitted to further examination amounts to a repudiation of established principles of international arbitration. This suggestion is without foundation in fact or support in law.

Theoretically, every decision of an arbitrator, whether he be an international umpire or a local arbitrator, is final and conclusive. The expression of such intent in the body of a protocol providing for international arbitration adds nothing to the commonly accepted logic of such a submission. Even though not so expressly declared, the decisions of an arbitrator, freely chosen by the contending parties to judge their differences, is commonly to be accepted as final and conclusive. But this theory of utter finality has, since the birth of the principle of arbitration itself, ever been subject to exceptions which, through the passing cen-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

turies, have become definitely defined and precisely expressed in the decisions of tribunals of great weight and in the writings of publicists of undoubted authority. For instance, the writer of the very article which affords excuse for this reply* admits that, in cases involving fraud on the part of the arbitrators, the decision of an arbitral tribunal, even though international in character, may be disregarded; but he suggests that, "unless fraud is alleged, the United States should set the example of abiding by the decision of international arbitration as at present constituted, no matter how crude the system." What is meant or was intended to be meant by the expression, "International arbitration as at present constituted"? Did its author mean to suggest by its use that the United States, while maintaining its place in the very forefront of all the nations which proclaim the virtues and value of International Arbitration, should disregard the settled principles and well-defined limitations upon which the entire structure of such arbitrations is bottomed? It must be assumed that such was not his intention, for, in the absence of at least a few reasonably well-defined rules or principles commonly accepted, and by which all arbitrations, municipal as well as international, must be governed, arbitration itself as a principle of governmental action probably could not long exist.

It being conceded that fraud will vitiate the decision of an arbitral tribunal of international character, and it thus appearing that such decisions are not absolutely inviolable, may it not well be that other grounds exist upon which the refusal of a party or a nation to lend adherence to such decisions in particular cases may be reasonably defended?

As was the case in the present instance between the United States and Venezuela, it is customary for the parties to arbitral conventions to agree upon articles of submission, and to define the powers of the arbitrators and the limitations of their authority, and sometimes to prescribe rules of procedure. If an arbitrator sworn to uphold and administer such articles of submission should incontinently or otherwise disregard their terms or exceed the powers conferred upon him thereby, is it to be said that the parties to the submission are nevertheless to stand bound by his award?

* "Has the United States Repudiated International Arbitration?" By Philip Walter Henry. NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, December, 1907.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As already said, it is a well-settled principle that the judgments of arbitral tribunals, speaking generally, are to be accepted as final and conclusive; that the vital principle of arbitration is wanting where the high contracting parties, or either of them, openly or covertly reserve to themselves the right to dissent from the final decree of the arbitrators. But it is equally well settled that such judgments may be disregarded, and that, too, with honor, (1) when the arbitrators have exceeded the powers conferred upon them by the articles of submission; (2) when the terms of the articles of submission have been disregarded or evaded; (3) when the award is equivocal or uncertain; (4) when the award was obtained by fraud or corruption; and (5) when the award is contrary to accepted principles of international law or amounts to a flagrant denial of justice.*

Volkerrecht does not hesitate to declare that

"If, however, the arbitrators, by pronouncing a sentence evidently unjust and unreasonable, should forfeit the character with which they are invested, their judgment would deserve no attention."

Calvo, the *vade mecum* of every Latin-American and Spanish-speaking Power, great or small, declares that international awards may ever be "disregarded" where the arbitrators have proceeded without authority, or when any member of the tribunal is legally or morally incapacitated, or where there has been bad faith or corruption on the part of such members, or *where the terms under which the question was submitted to the tribunal have been disregarded,* or where the decision is absolutely contrary to right and justice. Hall, an English-speaking writer of world-wide reputation, sums up the matter as follows:

"An arbitral decision may be disregarded in the following cases, viz., when the tribunal has clearly exceeded the powers given to it by the instrument of submission, when it is guilty of an open denial of justice, when its award is proved to have been obtained by fraud or corruption, and when the terms of the award are equivocal."

It is also a well-recognized principle of national intercourse, repeatedly exemplified in the practice of the United States, and of which Venezuela herself has not been slow to claim the benefit, that no sovereign can in honor press or insist upon the recognition of an unjust or mistaken award, even though made by an inter-

* Vattel, Book II, ch. 18, par. 329; Heffter, par. 109; Phillimore 111, par. 3; Calvo, pars. 1512–1532; Hall, par. 119.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

national tribunal invested with the power of swearing witnesses and of receiving or rejecting testimony.

The Republic of Venezuela has repeatedly exercised the right to protest against, and repudiate for cause, sentences of arbitral tribunals, and in the report of the Venezuelan Minister of Foreign Affairs to the National Congress of 1904 her attitude in such regard is stated as follows:

"The fact that Venezuela subscribed to the agreements to which I have referred [the protocols of 1903], and that by virtue of said agreements the Mixed Commissions entered upon an examination of the claims of foreign subjects, did not impose upon the Government the duty of indiscriminately accepting the sentences they might render. In such cases, the very faith that is to be placed in treaties, as well as the importan of arbitration in the solution of international litigations, make it incumbent upon the Governments availing themselves of it to become zealous guardians of the procedure of the persons to whom they confide such a high mission as that of settling their disagreements. The presumption that the arbiters must discharge their functions in a proper manner may at times be unfounded, and then the sentences ought not to deserve the respect nor do they have the authority which the protocol gives them. The character of a final decision cannot always be conceded to arbitral decisions merely because they proceed from the persons appointed to constitute an arbitration commission, for if the treaty attributes such a character to them beforehand, it is only in the belief that such decisions would not be vitiated in any manner that could render them ineffectual.

"The cause of arbitration would suffer severe injury if the principle should come to be accepted that all arbitral decisions must be carried out, whatever they may be. Publicists have already declared unanimously in favor of the right that Governments have to seek the invalidation of certain sentences, and well known are the causes that, in their opinion, may lead to that recourse."

President Castro himself, in his annual message to the same National Congress of 1904, as appears from the translation made thereof by Pedro Rafael Rincones, then consul-general of Venezuela at New York, which translation was largely circulated in this country, declared the view of his Government as well as of himself concerning national rights and duties in such circumstances in the following words:

"Of the awards made by the Mixed Commissions, it was necessary and obligatory for us to protest against the one relating to the claim made by the general company of the Caracas water-works. That award being in flagrant contradiction to the provisions of the protocol and the principles of equity, the Republic could not admit it, as its recognition

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would have implied the abdication of its right and the discredit of the arbitration; since, if similar decisions were to be accepted, being in themelves null, the high ends which are sought by the institution of arbitration for the furtherance of harmony and justice would be turned to ridicule, as would also the trust and confidence which should be deserved by the judges. We had also to make a like protest against the sentence delivered by the respective umpires on appeal made from the Venezuelan-Mexican Commission. That sentence, which can only be qualified as absurd, occasioned surprise to everybody, and gave rise to an unpleasant situation for a diplomat who had until then been appreciated amongst us."

The fact that, upon reflection, President Castro and his advisers concluded that the protests so made by their Government were not well founded, and could not be sustained, and therefore caused them to be withdrawn, does not detract one whit from the principles of action which he and his Minister of Foreign Affairs so forcibly and with such good reason proclaimed.

If "international arbitration as at present constituted" is at all amenable to the rules and principles of international law above set forth—and who can reasonably doubt that it is?—what one, having regard for his own reputation, will venture to deny that upon all the facts and circumstances of the Orinoco Steamship Company's case the United States is not only acting in strict right, but also in full accord with equity and good conscience in disregarding the award of the umpire and in insisting that the claims of that company, which include among them at least one item of considerable amount which Venezuela herself had diplomatically admitted that she owed, shall be submitted to further arbitration before a competent and impartial tribunal?

It is true that our Government in this instance "has refused to abide by the decision of an international arbitrator, and has practically gone to the point of ultimatums to force a reopening," and it is asked, "Would such a course have been pursued against a stronger nation, and is our State Department justified in such action?"

It is our pleasure to be able to reply to this inquiry in the affirmative, and historical precedent in confirmation of such reply is easily at hand.

In 1827, when the general disparity in wealth and power between the United States and Great Britain was not totally dissimilar to that now existing between the United States and Vene-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

zuela, it was agreed between the two first-mentioned Powers to submit to the determination of an arbitrator the pending question as to the true divisional line between the United States and the adjacent British possessions on the north, and a convention to that end was agreed upon and executed. The King of the Netherlands was chosen as arbitrator, and in his award, given at The Hague in 1831, he held that neither of the lines claimed by the contending Powers under the treaty of peace of 1782-83 sufficiently answered the calls of that treaty to require preference to be given to one Power over the other, and so, abandoning as impractical the attempt to draw the line described in the treaty, he recommended in his award a line of convenience. The agent of the United States protested the award on the ground that it was not in accord with the powers conferred upon the arbitrator by the contracting parties. The British Government signified its readiness to acquiesce in the recommendation of the arbitrator. President Jackson declined to do so, and subsequently submitted the question of acceptance or rejection to the Senate, which, by a vote of 35 to 8, resolved that the award was not obligatory, and "advised" the President to open a new negotiation with Great Britain for the exact ascertainment of the line. The matter was finally settled by the Webster-Ashburton treaty of 1842.

Other precedents to like effect are not lacking, but want of space forbids their citation.

The single instance referred to, however, would seem to be a sufficient refutation of the unpatriotic suggestion that in the case of Venezuela or any other minor power the United States has used or would be likely to use measures to which it would not resort in the case of a more powerful opponent.

As neither the United States nor Great Britain in that case found any insuperable difficulty or objection in the way of disregarding the arbitral decision of the King of the Netherlands, it would seem that in the case of the Orinoco Steamship Company the Government of Venezuela with even less difficulty and certainly with no greater loss of prestige might agree to disregard the palpably unjust decision of an umpire who is a mere subject of that country.

FREDERIC D. MCKENNEY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE DECLINE AND FALL OF WAGNER.

BY REGINALD DE KOVEN.

PROGRESS and development; these are the watchwords of Art!

Progress, in its resistless march along the road of the inexorable law of the survival of the fittest, looms up dominant and overpowering; a very iconoclast to overthrow movements, shatter ideals, destroy theories, overturn idols from their pedestals, to rob many a laureate of his wreath, and snatch the mantle of fame from many a hero. And all this the world must face and endure as best it may; for without progress and development Art would lose vitality, that power of expansion and recrudescence which is the cardinal essential of its being.

To avoid a misapprehension which might deem the statement made in the caption of this article subversive, incendiary and even impertinent, a very *lèse-majesté,* as it were, to a monarch of Art, its intent and purpose should be defined and made clear *ab initio.* To Wagner the tone poet, Wagner the maker of a new musical epoch, Wagner the emotional philosopher who, like a Napoleon, has changed the map of the musical world and impressed his commanding genius and individuality on his art in ineradicable fashion that will endure as long as the Art itself, I do not refer. It is with Wagner the stage craftsman, Wagner the dramatist, Wagner the high priest and prophet of a new order of things operatic, the inventor of a new Art form, and the certain decline and probable fall of his works in popular estimation from this standpoint, that this article has to do.

And, first, as to the fact; and the indications pointing to a probable, or even possible, decline and fall of the works of a Master who, for years and until recently, has absorbed and held the practically undivided attention of the musical world.

During the season now drawing to a close, a condition of affairs operatic wholly without precedent in musical annals has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

obtained in New York, in the simultaneous and successful financial existence and continuance of two Opera Houses, each giving performances of Grand and Lyric Opera of the highest artistic order of excellence, by an *ensemble* of artists which has included, first and last, the name of practically every great star now set in the operatic firmament.

Such conditions have never existed previously in any capital of the world; for, in cities like Vienna and Munich, where Grand Opera is given in more than one Opera House, there is no competition between rival managements; a single company being drawn on to supply their various operatic needs. In Paris the Opéra and the Opéra Comique, though trenching more than formerly on each other's peculiar domain through the present dedication of the latter house principally to Lyric Operas, like "Louise," are separate and distinct, both equally under Government patronage, and conducted without thought of interference, competition or rivalry, the one with the other.

These conditions, and the present likelihood of their permanence, make New York to-day the principal operatic centre of the world, and the cultivation and cosmopolitan character of its music-loving population insure a catholicity of taste in its audiences, the expression of which makes a sufficiently broad basis on which to rest an opinion and judgment justly applicable to Opera the world over.

Taking, therefore, New York as a reasonable criterion of operatic taste, and without delving into numerical statistics of the performances of his works abroad, the fact may be stated as incontrovertible that the decline and fall of Wagner, as a writer of musico-dramatic works and operas, in popular interest and appreciation is to-day marked and definite. New York has never known a season when fewer of Wagner's works have been performed; when performances of these works have aroused so little popular interest, or enlisted so scant a measure of popular support. At the newer Opera House no single performance of any one of the Wagner operas has been given, and a query to the manager as to the reason of this state of affairs elicted the reply: "Why should I give them? The public don't want them!" At the older house, where Wagner and all his works reigned supreme only a few years ago, to the practical exclusion of the standard repertory, Puccini is paramount, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Verdi, whom ardent Wagnerites had consigned to a deserved and unconsidered oblivion, is triumphantly *redivivus*. A performance of one of the dramas of the "Ring," like "Die Walkuere" or "Siegfried," which formerly would attract an eager, enthusiastic throng almost reverential in interest and attention, is now greeted with a careless apathy amounting to indifference and half a house, the popular-priced seats being noticeably empty; while "Trovatore" with Caruso, which means a vocal performance, packs the house from pit to dome. The more formal operas, like "Tannhäuser," "The Flying Dutchman" and the once supremely popular "Lohengrin," meet with a like fate; so that it would seem that Wagner altogether, and not merely Wagner as an operatic theorist in a special field of his own discovery—the Music-Drama—is on the decline.

It may be urged to account for this that the work of artists, like the de Reszkes and others, who proved that Wagner was not unvocal and could be artistically sung, has spoiled our audiences for performances of less artistic merit; that the present presentations of the Wagner works do not equal those of former years in point of general excellence, completeness and the true Wagnerian spirit and tradition; but the position thus taken is not, to my thinking, a tenable one, or the contention thus raised a just one. The performances of these operas this year have been given by the best and most reputed singers obtainable anywhere, and, whatever their shortcomings, are at least as good as could be seen anywhere else in the world at the present time.

No; while the fact under discussion is undeniable, the reasons for existing conditions lie deeper, and must be found elsewhere. In three directions, as I hold, may good and sufficient reasons to account satisfactorily for the waning interest in and appreciation of Wagnerian opera and music-drama be looked for: in the inherent character of the works themselves; behind the curtain among the singers; and in front of it among the audience. And as it is the audience that constitutes the final court of artistic appeal—the audience in whose hands lie the ultimate fate and destiny of all works written either to entertain or instruct them, for which appeal is made to their favor; the audience, whose judgment, after all, formulates the opinion of posterity—it may be interesting first to note what conclusions regarding the subject under discussion may be drawn from their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tastes and sympathies, as evidenced by their attitude toward the works in question.

In the degrees and shades of their individual appreciation the adherents and admirers of Wagner might a short time since have been divided into four classes: the Exclusive, the Rational, the Intuitive and the Partial.

To the first, now practically done away with, belong the fanatic, frenetic Wagnerites, who in an extravagant admiration amounting almost to impertinence, worship the master of Baireuth as the only composer who ever lived or could live—thus robbing the art of music both of its past and of its future,—and who, in denying the works of all other composers, past and present, as unworthy of attention or consideration, only admit their own ignorance and lack of artistic intelligence and understanding. The disappearance of this formerly large class was inevitable, and has certainly tended to diminish the size of Wagnerian audiences.

To the "Rational" admirers of the second class belong the educated and cultured musicians, who, realizing that Wagner has crowned the progressive development of music as an art with the glorious crown of his wonderful genius, admire sanely and justly because they understand what there is to admire. This class still remains; but as the art moves ever forward in progress and development, the allegiance of even this class can no longer continue so exclusive, as their interest and admiration are constantly drawn away in other directions toward newer fields of progressive effort.

The "Intuitive," who might also be called the temperamental, admirer of the third class, depends for his enjoyment on mere feeling and sensation, rather than on any musical knowledge or training. The varied and rich color, the dynamic contrast, the impact force of the orchestra in its appeal to the sensitory nerves, attracts his attention and stimulates his emotions. Though ignorant musically, he is moved, he knows not why, and so admires; and his admiration continues so long as his senses are affected and these temperamental and emotional sensations are renewed. But the music of more modern composers who have out-Wagnered Wagner, who with added din and tumult of orchestral thunder hurl masses of strenuous sound down the spines of their listeners and thus outvie and go beyond in sensuous in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tensity and power the temperamental influences which Wagner understood so well how to create, has weaned away many admirers of this class in giving them newer, bolder and more vivid musical sensations. Thus again has a part of the audience which Wagner once controlled and swayed exclusively, been lessened and diminished.

To the last class, perhaps the largest,—now that time has lessened the overwhelming dominance of the personal and contemporaneous influence of a mighty genius, has penetrated the mists of prejudice and extravagance for and against, and so brought about the possibility of calmer, saner and more considered critical judgment,—belongs the "Partial" admirer. The former doctrine that Wagner could do no wrong he disallows; he admires with reservations, admits the possibility of intelligent criticism, and, without being thought a Philistine and outside the pale, can express an opinion, now shared by an ever-increasing number, that the Wagner operatic works are almost invariably too long, are often dull, seldom vocally agreeable after the manner of other schools, and might generally be cut to advantage.

One may thus readily discover, in the attitude towards his works of each and of every class of Wagner admirers, a reason for the decline and fall in the popular interest and appreciation in and of those works, which is the subject of this article.

If we turn to the behind-the-scenes country, the world back of the curtain peopled by the artists and singers whose mission it is to realize and interpret the works of this great master, we find without difficulty a variety of new reasons and conditions, different indeed, but even more cogent and weighty in effect, bearing and influence on the question before us.

It is now generally admitted that Wagner wrote inconsiderately, if not unskilfully, for voices, using them like orchestral instruments without proper regard for their physical possibilities and limitations. In spite of this, and on the other hand, it has been successfully demonstrated by many great artists, and notably by M. Jean de Reszke (whose rendering of the rôles of Lohengrin, Tristan and Walther in "*Die Meistersinger*," in showing us how effective they were vocally if properly sung, has spoiled us for all other interpretations), that Wagner's music could be artistically sung without violating the true Wagnerian spirit

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and tradition. But at what cost? Where are the great Wagnerian singers to-day? The former ones used up, retired before their time by the effort to endue with vocal art irresponsive vocal conditions which admitted of it but hardly. The present ones, of inferior excellence generally speaking, struggle as best they may with the same well-nigh impossible vocal conditions, or, as is now often the case, refuse these conditions altogether and decline to sing Wagner's music at all.

And this same Wagner tradition has had much to do with bringing about these conditions which make the decline of Wagner as an operatic writer a certainty; his fall and relative desuetude merely a question of time. The ardent Wagnerite was wont to say: "Wagner need not be sung; indeed, should not be sung"! A marvellous dictum, truly, when the experience which Wagner has helped largely to make has shown that the human voice, properly used, as the most potent means of emotional effect known to musical art, cannot be disregarded or made secondary in any scheme or system broadly speaking operatic, involving any possible union of text and music, if that scheme or system is to remain vital or endure..

A few years ago I unearthed in a German newspaper, enthusiastically Wagnerian in sympathy, the following precious commentary on an authoritative enunciation of the Wagnerian vocal theory and tradition. If voices or vocal art have anything to do with opera or music-drama at all, the complete reasons for the decline and fall of Wagner lie imbedded in this remarkable utterance, this astounding pronunciamento of a well-known exponent of so-called Wagnerian theories:

"If I were to call a Dienstmann from the street, and placing before him a Wagner score, and allowing he could sing it at sight, the way that he would sing that music naturally and without previous training would be the way Wagner's music should be sung."

Small wonder, then, if singers, as now, are beginning to refuse to imperil natural vocal gifts or waste years of vocal training in singing music that "need not be sung." Where, then, as the present generation of singers is fast disappearing, are the future singers of Wagner music to come from or be found? If, as seems to be the case, Wagner's music, whether well sung, or shouted in Dienstmann fashion, is too exacting in its demands on the human voice to allow of voices successfully complying with those de-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mands for any length of time without permanent injury or complete disability, it is also evident that with the singers themselves lie perhaps the principal reasons for the inevitable decline and fall of Wagner for purposes operatic. If, again, the practicability of singing this music artistically be admitted, it is so much more difficult to sing effectively than music written with more regard for the possibilities of the human voice, that singers turn with natural preference to such music, and audiences, having once more become accustomed to the delights of *Bel Canto* from such artists as Tetrazzini and Sembrich, Caruso, Bonci, Renaud and their peers, find that even the best Wagnerian singers suffer by comparison and lose in both interest and charm, as well as in their capacity to provide artistic pleasure and enjoyment. And this is a reason in point which accounts for so much in the wane of the Wagner music-drama that it may not be lightly set aside or underestimated.

It may, therefore, I think, be admitted as having been shown conclusively that, in the attitude of the singers as well as in that of audiences regarding it, ample reasons may be found to justify the contention made, that there is a decided and rapidly growing change in the feelings of both musicians and the public at large toward Wagner's music in connection with the operatic stage.

If we turn our attention, sanely and without prejudice, to the inherent character of Wagner's art and his theories of it as exemplified in his operas and music-dramas, we shall again and without difficulty find satisfactory and convincing reasons for the decline of that art in popular estimation.

It has been said that the longevity of a work of art is in direct ratio to the nobility of its conception, and its humanity or truth to human nature. In like manner, it may be said that the proof of the truth of any theory lies in the universality of its possible application. To question the nobility of conception inherent in all of Wagner's works would be idle; but their humanity, and the universality of application of the theories which governed their construction, in view of present indications affecting their enduring qualities, may well be doubted.

Wagner held that legendary and mythological lore was the only source from which subjects proper for musico-dramatic

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

treatment could be drawn, and it is largely the character of the subjects of his music-dramas which seems to-day to militate against them with the public. Life now is very real, very intense; day by day the world goes further away from the romantic and nearer the practical. The problem-play has ousted the play of romance; the drama of action has taken the place of the drama of emotion. Events move too rapidly, life in its kaleidoscopic change and variety is too vivid, too restless in nervous perfervid energy, to allow of our sitting contentedly through long hours in contemplation of the actions of giants, dwarfs and dragons, of the doings of mythical heroes and demigods and their impossible sexual relations, which touch real human nature at no point. It is this lack of humanity in the Wagner operas and music-dramas which transgresses the axiomatic canon governing the longevity of a work of art, and in so far is a fruitful cause of their present decadence.

Other causes lie in their inordinate and anything but divine length, for Wagner, intense egoist that he was, never thought he could say too much; in their depressing lack of movement and action through long and arid wastes of dreary monologue and dull soliloquy; and in the lack of opportunity for effective vocal display, and the heart-breaking demands on vocal endurance alluded to above. All reasons enough and to spare, one would think, to fully account for and explain existing conditions which may hardly be denied. In the rush and turmoil of present-day existence people like their emotions short, sharp and to the point; —hence the vogue of Puccini and the modern Italians,—and go more and more to the theatre and opera for mental relaxation and amusement. However interesting, artistic and moving the Wagner music-dramas may be, the wildest stretch of imagination could hardly call them amusing; while to properly appreciate the wonderful beauty which cannot be denied them is more often a severe mental strain than a relaxation.

Wagner himself is responsible for the statement that Love was the subject of all his dramas from the "Dutchman" to "Parsifal," and it is in the character and treatment of their love-stories, as it seems to me, that these dramas are lacking in that real humanity and human interest which must be inherent in any work of art to insure its lasting vitality. The passion, the love, which is the supreme law of nature, of "Tristan and Isolde"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is too tense, too physical, to fail in its universal, sensuous appeal. But apart from their mythological character, which makes them inhuman rather than human, the love-stories of the "Ring" dramas, in their wanton defiance of natural law in love, are repellent rather than attractive; and which one among the Wagner heroines, Senta, Elsa, Elisabeth or Eva, really enlists our sympathies or holds our interest? The mystic atmosphere of legendary lore which through each one moves seems to rob their characters of that intangible something which touches the answering chord of understanding and sympathy in our hearts. They do not seem of our world, these poetically imaginative heroines, but look out at us as through a veil of unreality; shadowy, remote, apart.

How far the character of the absolute musical structure of these dramas may affect their permanence is still a debatable question. The idea of Wagner's lack of melody has been so completely exploded as to be unworthy of discussion. But for all their melodiousness it may well be that the lack of more formal, salient, fluent melody, of melody which sings itself naturally like that of Mozart, in these dramas, has had not a little to do with their present decline in popular favor. And yet how simple, and even obviously melodic, passages formerly thought discordant and recondite now sound! Wagner's theory of the "*Leit-motif*" or illustrative theme, and his magnificent development of the orchestra as a factor in the general scheme of construction and effect, seem so firmly engrafted on modern musical thought and methods, and their influence is everywhere so apparent, that they strike one as the elements in these dramas most likely to obtain permanently. It must be borne in mind, however, that the Wagnerian music-dramas have, so far, been without successors; that no musico-dramatic work of real importance and significance—unless it be Strauss's "Salome"—in strict exemplification of the Wagnerian theories has yet been written, so that it would be dangerous and misleading to accept the success of special instances of transcendent genius as indicating the permanent artistic value or universal applicability of the means whereby this success has been achieved.

The Wagnerian theories have not yet been proved to be practical working theories susceptible of general application to musico-dramatic art, and it is their continued empirical charac-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ter which is responsible for the unrest which pervades the musical world to-day, and has beyond question much to do with their present decadence and may account for their ultimate downfall.

The influence, on the art of music as a whole, of the existing uncertainty as to the eventual fate of the Wagner music-dramas, is another question, and quite outside the intent and scope of this article, but one which need cause no disquietude. Beethoven built on the foundations laid by Bach; on the structure thus created Wagner reared his mighty superstructure. Music, the youngest of the arts, is still young, instinct with vitality and susceptible of continued further progress, as recent modern development conclusively proves. Who, then, shall say that another epoch-making genius will not arise to crown the edifice in the upbuilding of which Wagner, with Bach and Beethoven, played his mighty and significant rôle?

In view of obvious existing conditions, the fact suggested by this article can hardly be intelligently doubted; the reasons adduced to adequately account for it seem both good and sufficient; and if within so short a time the whilom "Music of the Future," as may hardly be gainsaid, has become the Music of the Present, is it unreasonable to predict that with corresponding rapidity —for the world moves fast these days—it may in its turn become the Music of the Past?

REGINALD DE KOVEN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

JOURNALISM, POLITICS AND THE UNIVERSITY.*

BY THE EDITOR.

UNFORTUNATELY, no definition of journalism has yet found general acceptance, and none probably could be made that would stand the test of critical analysis. Its most famous exemplars achieved power and distinction by methods so varied, and from motives so diverse, as to render exact induction impossible. To Franklin, the printer, it was a trade; to Bryant, the poet, it was literature; to Greeley, the apostle, it was evangelism; to Raymond, the disputant, it was polemics; to Bennett, the cynic, it was manufacture; to Dana, the satirist, it was an art; to Godkin, the caviller, it was hypercriticism. Each earned and won renown in a manner peculiar to himself, not because he was a great journalist, but because he was a great man—and in this respect of actual, personal achievement the name of Garrison, the zealot, leads all the rest. In breaking the bonds of traditional political thraldom, these eager minds rendered superb service to the cause of free thought and independent expression, but in one or more of the essentials of true journalism in its highest and broadest meaning each was singularly deficient.

THE MASTER JOURNALIST.

The master journalist must have stability of purpose and coolness of judgment. Greeley had neither. Impulsive, erratic, heedless in thought, violent in expression, eager to lead, no matter whither, impatient of restraint of any kind, the mighty influence acquired by his undoubted genius, reinforced by public faith in the purity of his intentions and the worship even of his obvious faults by the multitude of his followers, was wielded for ill almost as frequently as for good, and more than

* The substance of the Bromley Lecture delivered at Yale University on March 12th, 1908.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

once seriously imperilled the very existence of the nation which he loved with the fervor of a votary.

The master journalist must have perspective as well as perception; his is a jealous calling demanding the exercise of every mental and moral fibril, and exacting above all that consistency which is inseparable from conviction. Keen and brilliant as he was, Raymond could make no discrimination between essentials and non-essentials when opportunity for contention offered. Peddler or archbishop could draw his fire by the merest allusion; no threat of controversy was too absurd, no source thereof too insignificant, to absorb his entire interest and distract his attention from public affairs. Yet more serious was his subordination of a great journal to the petty purposes of a political party, in the machinery of which he most prided himself upon being one of a hundred cogs—hence his variableness of policy, which became a byword and sapped his authority.

The master journalist must have conscience, character, conviction; his aim must be to uplift humanity, not to profit by its degradation. Bennett had personal integrity; he never sold an opinion; he never cheated or lied or bowed before mammon—and he was the most energetic and successful gatherer of news the world has produced. But he was indifferent to principle, contemptuous of things held most sacred by his fellow beings, and strove solely to detect the trend of popular sentiment that he might hasten to please the mob and pay additional tribute to his great and only god—Success! a curiously complex, marvellously self-developed manufacturer of food and poison, pilled and labelled to gratify any palate and to meet all conceivable demands.

The master journalist must cherish no personal animosities; though relentless in pursuit of wrong-doers, he must be just and forbearing when vindictiveness could only inflict pain upon the innocent and serve no useful purpose. Dana was the prince of his craft, the skilled workman, the artist, the developer of style, the first and so far the last hand at the loom from which spins the finished product. To the intensity of his nature we must attribute the unforgiving spirit which marred a professional career otherwise unmatched in proficiency.

The master journalist is suggestive, constructive. Godkin's talent was great and facile, but his instrument was the rapier; his hand never knew the trowel.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SAMUEL BOWLES.

A significant omission from this enumeration of men, the mere mention of whose names even in illustration of their defects evokes recognition of their distinction, is that of Samuel Bowles. It was not inadvertent; it was deliberate and purposeful. Bowles embodied a combination in greater or less degree of the finest qualities possessed by his famous contemporaries. Though in the view of the people he was less appealing than Greeley, in fact he was quite as earnest, quite as enthusiastic, quite as resolute in determination to supplant wrong with right at whatever hazard. His expression, except upon rare occasions when excitement burned through his veins, was less vivid, less brilliant than Raymond's, but it was always forceful, always rang true, and his discernment never wavered from the line of accurate diagnosis and the logical remedy. Unlike both Greeley and Raymond, he was able to curb his natural impetuosity and enhance by his very restraint the ultimate effect of his utterance — and his sound, sane judgment always sat at his elbow. He was not and could not have been, under the same conditions, a peer of Bennett in the gleaning and purveying of news; his didactic instincts were too dominant, his other interests too varied; but in his comparatively circumscribed field his work was characterized by no less painstaking thoroughness. His editorials lacked the finish that stamped those of Dana and Godkin, because his intellectual training was derived from association with men, while theirs came from intimacy with books. But take him all in all as a journalist, and few essentials will be found wanting. He was bold yet not daring for daring's sake, conscientious, both high minded and broad minded, firm in conviction, self-respecting, considerate of the weak, independent of the strong, unsordid, resolute in purpose, lucid, direct, convincing, able to perceive with the quickness of a lightning flash, to comprehend with the wisdom of a sage, and to deduce conclusions that seemed irrefragable to other minds because so they were felt to be by his. Despite the restrictions imposed upon him, it will not be surprising if the history of his generation shall accord first place in American journalism—as journalism pure and simple—to Samuel Bowles.

Herein we find a lesson. If it be true that Bowles outranked his gifted contemporaries, retaining to the end a truer perspective

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and sounder judgment, his pre-eminence obviously cannot be attributed to either mental or moral superiority; it must have sprung necessarily from another underlying cause. Such, in truth, is the fact. Bowles was free. Almost all of the others at some stage in their careers wore the shackles of personal political ambition. Greeley was a fitful aspirant to public office from the day his journal became a power, and he died, finally, broken-hearted by his inability to attain the Presidency, for which hardly a man then living was less fitted. Raymond, after years of active participation in practical politics, perceived the folly of his course and foreswore further entanglements, only, however, to discover that the habit had become irresistible, and at the time of his death he was chairman of a State committee. Dana's life was embittered and his judgment clouded by the refusal of a President and a Governor to recognize his personal claims. Even the incorrigible Bennett was hushed by the offer of a diplomatic mission. From the day when the first note of independence was sounded to the very present, the bane of journalism has been the political ambitions of the journalists themselves. Politicians have profited steadily and increasingly, and the public has suffered correspondingly, from this insatiable craving for public position. Nor have our foremost statesmen hesitated to avail themselves of the opportunities thus presented. President Lincoln may have been warranted in considering that the end justified the means when he offered to Bennett the ministry to France, but his act served only to silence criticism of Johnson when that President tendered the Austrian ministry to Raymond in return for support which could not otherwise have been obtained. To this day not only has the custom been maintained, but, judging from the fact that never before have so many editors and writers held appointive political positions as at present, it seems by no means to be waning.

The fitness or unfitness of those selected is not a point in issue. It is the practice only which we deprecate. And call it what we may—a bribe to ensure a continuance of allegiance or, less obnoxiously, a reward for services rendered — the outcome of every one of such transactions is the same, the people's loss of a champion, and a newspaper's sacrifice of its birthright for a glittering bauble.

What, then, shall we conclude? That an editor shall bar acceptance of public position under any circumstances? Yes, abso-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lutely, and any thought or hope of such preferment, else his avowed purpose is not his true one, his policy is one of deceit in pursuance of an unannounced end; his guidance is untrustworthy, his calling that of a teacher false to his disciples for personal advantage, his conduct a gross betrayal not only of public confidence, but also of the faith of every true journalist jealous of a profession which should be of the noblest and the farthest removed from base uses in the interest of selfish men.

JOURNALISM AND POLITICS IRRECONCILABLE.

There is but one conceivable conclusion in logic or in morals, namely, that true journalism and the politics that seeks personal advancement are not and cannot be made co-operative; from the radical difference in their very natures and the impossibility of reconciling what should be the idealism of the one with the practicalism of the other, they must be essentially antagonistic. That in fact they are is evident. The chief, if not indeed the sole, aim of the politician is to win the favor of the majority. To achieve this purpose he does not scruple; in the language of his craft he "keeps his ear to the ground," and the magnitude of his success is measured by the shrewdness with which he divines popular tendencies sufficiently in advance of their general manifestation to appear to be the leader of a movement to establish newly discovered principles rather than a skilful conjecturer of evanescent popular whims. It follows necessarily that the journal animated by any other than a like motive, that is, the desire to profit from pandering to mobilized selfishness, is so hateful to the aspiring politician that in his view it must be discredited. Hence the frequency and virulence of assaults upon newspapers which for one reason or another dissent from views expressed by politicians, sometimes no doubt in sincerity, but always in hope of currying public favor. The reasoning of such a journal is seldom combated; a mere questioning of its motives is deemed and generally is found to be vastly more efficacious. So it often happens in even these enlightened days that a newspaper undergoing no change in control may to-day be pronounced patriotic and devoted to the cause of the people and to-morrow be denounced as a servant of special interests and an enemy of the country, in precise accord with its defence or criticism of political measures and men.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One of our most conspicuous statesmen—if the term, despite its apparent obsoleteness, may still be applied to the holder of a high public office—recently declared that the sole mission of journalism is to detect and encourage popular tendencies. In truth, such a conception is the basest imaginable, but it is the politician's and probably always will be. Nor can we honestly deny that it is the easier and likely to prove more profitable and more comfortable. Surely any one possessing human sensibilities would rather be heralded as a tribune of the people than as a hireling of capital, a panderer to labor or a common mercenary—and yet such detraction is a form of misery that the politician may avoid, while the journalist must endure it, for the simple reason that the god of the one is expediency, and of the other, principle.

I do not criticise the politician for following the mob; success in his trade is dependent upon his ability to satisfy the cravings, whatever they may happen to be at the time, of the majority; nor do I complain of his pretending to lead when really he only follows by catering to prejudice, since it is well within his province to deceive as many of the voters as much of the time as his talents permit. Even his traditional championship of, and appeals to, the "common people" may be condoned. So many millions have not only borne with equanimity but accepted with gratefulness for so many years that transparent insult, that its constant repetition engenders mild amusement rather than the deep indignation which rightfully it should evoke. My sole purpose is to mark the complete antithesis in theory and in practice of journalism and politics, in order to emphasize the inevitable antagonism to which I have referred between a profession that should be noble and a trade that is essentially sordid. To be the first to detect and the most eager to satisfy popular caprice is the acme of personal political achievement; to protect the people from themselves, to point out their errors and urge rectification, is the true mission of journalism. "Gathering the wisdom of ages as into a sheaf of sunbeams, it shows that progress springs from the minority, and that if it will but stand fast, time will give it victory." Into a single familiar stanza Bryant, the journalist, compressed the battle-song:

> "Truth crushed to earth shall rise again;
> The eternal years of God are hers;
> But Error, wounded, writhes with pain,
> And dies among his worshippers."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The distinction lies between dependence upon and independence of the majority—and in this respect great strides have been made in American journalism. The asperities of to-day seem innocuous when compared with those of the good old times when charges of treason filled the air, when Republican journals solemnly accused Federalists of plotting to establish a monarchy by force of arms, when Federalist newspapers denounced Republican statesmen as Jacobins, when Jay was anathematized as a scoundrel and Jefferson as an atheist and satyr, and when, as on the morning after Washington retired from the Presidency, the principal organ of the Opposition devoutly thanked God that at last the country was rid of the man who had been the source of all its misfortunes. Even so late as the era of the brilliant men to whom I have referred, public journals were the slaves of political parties, but whatever the shortcomings of the present, the pall of partisanship at least has lifted, and there is no press in the world comparable to that of America in freedom from venal influences.

PROVINCIALISM OF THE PRESS.

"A chartered libertine," the American press may be as distinctly to-day as when the discriminating Curtis so designated it twenty-five years ago, and yet, how true it is now as then, as he hastened to add, that "No abuse of its privileges can be so great as the evil of its suppression." There remains only the necessity of refining the expression and enhancing the independence which constitutes the real soul of a public journal. At this point exacting human nature raises obstacles. The vast majority of men are technically honest, but few are honest in their minds. So, too, while all really influential newspapers are nominally independent, few proprietors and editors are unaffected by one consideration or another. Environment wields the greatest force, and so it should. It is right and proper, no less than inevitable, that a newspaper should reflect the sentiments of the community in which it has its being, and upon whose support its very existence depends. In the fact that a journal published in a manufacturing city in New England upholds protection, or that one speaking for the farmers of the West advocates free trade, or that one printed in New York demands rigorous laws bearing upon finance, we find no cause for censure. Each voices the spirit of its own community in perfect conformity with the democratic theory which forms

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the basis of our institutions; but it is a grave question whether at this time, when the bands of steel have knit so closely together the various sections and rendered all so wholly interdependent, the growth of tolerance and consideration has kept pace with material progress. Provincialism has ceased to be dominant in American journalism, but it continues to be a factor of no little magnitude, irritating, harmful, even pregnant with danger unless modified by a broader recognition of the rights and privileges of all who constitute a mighty population that must be united to withstand the baleful forces which hitherto have wrecked republics.

TRUE INDEPENDENCE.

The journalist, then, must be independent, not only of politics, but of his community. His interest is its interest, but his entire obligation is not fulfilled by mere representation of that interest, however accurate it may be. He is, above all, a teacher who through daily appeals to the reason and moral sense of his constituency should become a real leader. Nor should his independence be confined within city or State lines. His responsibility is to the whole people, but to perform fully his part he must be independent of the whole or of any portion. Nothing can be clearer than that the occasional supersession of statesmen in public authority by heralds of dubious evangels makes doubly important the rigorous application of common sense to even an uncommon people. Above capital, above labor, above wealth, above poverty, above class and above people, subservient to none, quick to perceive and relentless in resisting encroachments by any, the master journalist should stand as the guardian of all, the vigilant watchman on the tower ever ready to sound the alarm of danger, from whatever source, to the liberties and the laws of this great union of free individuals.

CAN JOURNALISM BE TAUGHT?

Can such an ideal be attained through education? Or, as is often asked, Can journalism be taught? Greeley not only dismissed the suggestion contemptuously as unworthy of consideration, but even went so far as to decry the academic training of the intellect, and he prayed for deliverance from "those horned cattle, the college graduates." The scholarly Dana also maintained that the only successful school of journalism is a newspaper-office; and this, I suspect, would be found upon inquiry to be the opinion of practically all journalists now in the front

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rank, with one notable exception. But will the common saying that a journalist is "born, not made," stand the test of analysis? Is it any more than assertion? Has any one ever tried to demonstrate its truth by process of reasoning, or could one hope to succeed in such an attempt in these days of wider and freer intellectual development in the universities? True, the familiar declaration that journalism cannot be taught as surgery or engineering is taught seems plausible, but is it indeed the fact? We may grant that certain technical knowledge respecting the mechanical construction of a newspaper can be derived most easily, if not solely, from actual experience; but that experience can be obtained as well without as within a newspaper-office if the facilities be afforded. This form of proficiency, moreover, is of the smallest comparative value, and bears a relationship to the practice of journalism as a profession hardly closer than the ability to conduct an advertising department. Surely, too, one can be taught how to write, edit, think, even how to perceive, as readily in a college as in a newspaper-office, the only conceivable advantage of the latter being that—of inestimable value, to be sure—which is derived from enforced practice; but even this cannot be regarded as unattainable, if the mental energy and ingenuity said to be exercised by some undergraduates in striving to avoid work could be diverted into other channels.

SELF-EDUCATION.

There is no novelty in the interminable parading of the exclusive or superior advantages of service in the "hard school of experience." Such prattle has issued from shallow intellects since systematic training of the mind began. We hear it at intervals even now from the lips of men whose self-sufficiency, flourishing like a noxious weed amid flowers of material achievement, prompts a tawdry display of dogmatism. That results alone constitute arguments, is their confident declaration deemed to be conclusive, and any lingering doubts are supposed to be quickly dispelled by contemplation of the handiwork of the complacent self-manufacturer. It is difficult at the beginning of the twentieth century to listen to such absurdities without manifesting impatience; and yet we may not with propriety disregard the obligation of tolerance in considering the opinions of men incapable of fixing the bases of their own prosperity. What

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

logic would pronounce effect they almost invariably believe to be cause, and the most obviously helpful circumstances win no recognition from their restricted imaginations as salutary or even contributory to equipment for achieving success. Examples without number, from Cavour, whose monument is united Italy, to Lincoln, whose glory is emancipation, are adduced as evidence that time utilized in training the intellect is wasted, and that liberal education is a bar to possible achievement through concentration. Wholly similar is the common misapprehension respecting the training of an American journalist deduced from the triumphs of Franklin, Greeley, Bennett, Bowles and some now living. Scorning to make the obvious retort, disdaining to instance the innumerable contrary examples from Pericles to Balfour, from Bacon to Godkin, it serves well our purpose to raise the simple query, whether the successes of those mentioned were accomplished because of or in spite of disadvantages that to the impersonal judgment seem apparent.

RESPONSIBILITY OF THE UNIVERSITY.

But all these are minor considerations. It is in a vastly broader sense that I shall try to show that if it be true that, in these days, a printer's devil who works his way up to an editorship is better equipped for the practice of journalism than a college man having like aspirations, there is on the part of trustees and faculty a woful deficiency in comprehension of the duty of the university to the people. Assuming general acceptance of the hypothesis that the power of the press for good or ill is very great and not diminishing, it is manifest that all available agencies should be utilized to render that influence as much for good and as little for ill as possible. Of these instrumentalities many might be enumerated, but not one, in this particular stage of commercial, scientific and moral development of the American people, can approach the university in effectiveness. We call this an age of specialism, and such indeed it is in all callings but one—and that one is journalism. We have only to refer to the stupendous and constant growth in population within our borders and the recent lightning-like expansion of our interest abroad to emphasize the fact that never before was such need of breadth of knowledge among those charged with the daily teaching of our millions.

Whatever may be our attitude towards the doctrine of "utility,"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whether we stand with Oxford or with Edinburgh, we may rest assured that not even Locke would deny the need to the modern journalist of liberal education, for the very simple and conclusive reason that universal knowledge is his requirement. And where can he obtain it if not from the university? And whose duty, if not the university's, is it to supply not only that liberal education itself, but also all minor helps pertaining to journalism, so that when the graduate begins his work his mind need not rust while perforce he is mastering the mere incidentals which constitute the sum of the knowledge of his office-bred competitor?

Hardly second in value to wide comprehensiveness of knowledge are clarity in thought and lucidity of expression; and from whom may we rightfully demand the development of these acquirements if not from the university? Criticism is an important function of journalism, but only a phase. It does not suffice to walk in the footsteps of the sages who taught Rasselas and the princes of Abyssinia, and who, according to Doctor Johnson, told them of nothing but the miseries of public life, and described all beyond the mountains as regions of calamity where "discord was always raging and where man preyed upon man." The ability to apprehend the correct viewpoint concerning a vital subject is vastly more important, calling not merely for the bodily eye provided by nature, but for what Newman so aptly designates as "the eye of the mind," whose object is truth, and itself is "the work of discipline and habit." Where, if not to the university, may we look for the maintenance of the discipline and the forming of the habits essential to the training of the intellect to so fine a point that, in subsequent public service, which is all that journalism really is or should be, discrimination between the true and the false shall require so little effort as to seem to spring from very instinct?

Journalism can never be history; its unceasing activities deprive it of the advantages of scientific inquiry. It cannot even be the rounded truth, since the necessity of prompt presentation of what seems to be fact renders impossible the gathering and weighing of all evidence which bears upon an event that must be chronicled. As a purveyor of what we call news, the newspaper cannot present daily a photograph of happenings; it can only give a picture, imperfect because painted by fallible beings. As a guide, it must form opinions and pronounce judgment instant-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ly; the delay of a day or even an hour at times would be fatal to full effectiveness. Hence the necessity for the most complete and finished mental training; and where, pray, can we look for the building of thoroughbred minds if not to the university?

INTELLECT, CHARACTER, CONSCIENCE.

Intellect! Independence! Each is essential and each can be cultivated. There is yet another trait whose possession is more vital than that of both combined. That is character, the foundation of all real achievement, which in turn finds its inspiration in a quality fortunately inherent in all men. The equality with which, according to our republican doctrine, human beings are endowed in common at birth is the equality of right alone—the right to exist unmolested, to enjoy freedom, to share evenly with others the opportunities vouchsafed by God to His children. The capacities to feel, perceive and express multifarious emotions which in the course of years crystallize into genius, talent or mere industry are distributed in widely varying degrees. No training of the mind can evolve a poet, no cultivation of the sense of hearing can create an understanding of music, no practice can imbue a sterile spirit with appreciation of humor. With respect to these and all similar attributes, so far from all being born equal, no two among the uncounted millions are born alike.

But there is one divine possession common to all men, from the most highly educated to the most ignorant, from the most spiritual to the most brutal, from the finest to the coarsest of natures. It is the faculty which compels men to regard their own acts and the acts of their fellows as possessing a moral quality, and which, when fully enlightened, puts upon the right the imprimatur of its conscious approval and upon the wrong the stamp of its conscious condemnation. In Christian theology it is the still small voice speaking a word of warning when such an one is needed; in modern philosophy it is the moral sense, conscience or, most exactly to the discriminating understanding, the spirit of truth. What it is we do not know. Whatever it may be, believers and scoffers alike admit its existence in every human breast—as a force, though latent, the most potent known agency in the control and direction of human conduct; and it is this element, this divine spark, that smoulders or leaps into flame, as it is neglected or encouraged, that becomes the core of character.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But while character is as dependent fundamentally upon the impelling force of conscience as the human organism is upon the pulsing of the heart, other qualities, although secondary in importance, are no less essential to the entire composition. Chief among these is a sense of personal honor. This trait can be acquired only through cultivation, which in turn is most naturally and readily realized through the traditions and associations afforded by the university. The motives which engender it are various and not inevitably, in the nicest sense, wholly worthy. The primary teaching, for example, that honesty should be practised simply for the sake of policy does not seem to conform with the spirit of high-mindedness, and yet it is too often the sum of the reasons derived from early secular schooling. The prompting of pride or even of the form of vanity which impels the wish to stand high in the estimation of one's fellows is far more meritorious, and it is this impulse which stirs within a man from the day on which he comes into contact with the standards which have become fixed by practice within the university. To the moral atmosphere of the gridiron and the baseball field, hardly less than to the shame of reflecting discredit upon one's Alma Mater, may safely be attributed the keen sense of personal honor to-day found almost invariably in the college graduate. And, if it be conceded, as it must be, that university life produces nobleness of mind, it is but a step to the conclusion that it must also refine the conscience, and it thus makes the perfect blend which we call character,—the first and indispensable requisite of true journalism.

FOR TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION.

Already, as we have seen, the university is building the fundamentals. Why should it not also supply the accessories and send forth to teach and lead the people, men so thoroughly equipped technically as well as mentally and morally that the mere fact of graduation, by opening the door of opportunity, would gradually but inevitably tend to subordinate materialism to a practical idealism which would raise the American press to its true position as foremost among God's agencies for the uplifting of the American people?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW BOOKS REVIEWED.

BY ADOLPH MEYER, CHARLES JOHNSTON AND JULIUS CHAMBERS.

"A MIND THAT FOUND ITSELF."*

THE human mind is the triumph of biological evolution; but, like all the boons that come to us, our mental development will at times miscarry—fortunately often merely as a warning against greater mischief, but often enough so as to bring us the saddest experience that can befall a family—to have a member alienated from the common ground of mental life for months, for years and perhaps for life. Untold unhappiness has been produced by minor forms as well as by the graver ones of the disorder. Here, for once, a mental illness has ended in a boon—it has matured, if not created, a man for a cause.

Mr. Beers, a graduate of Yale University, had the misfortune to develop a type of mental disorder such as is shown by about fifteen per cent. of those who are admitted to our State hospitals. After over two years of depression, governed by a not unusual tangle of misinterpretations of his situation, he emerged into an "elation" in which an eminently sane instinct got the upper hand—a desire to right injustice and to stand up for the Golden Rule. The provisions created for the care of such victims of fate and of ignorance — the hospitals small and large, private and public—are perhaps much better than the public and even the medical profession are apt to admit. But, alas! there are many defects in them, and the experience of Mr. Beers was more strenuous than that of the average patient, yet, as I have said, it may prove to have been for the good of many.

From a private institution which practically is the personal property of its medical head, he was taken to an endowed private

* "A Mind That Found Itself: an Autobiography." By Clifford Whittingham Beers. New York and London: Longmans, Green & Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

institution, and from there to a State hospital. He describes his experiences in a spirit of straightforward autobiography, and the result is a book which, if anything can, will rouse a sentiment among all, that there is much to be done for the amelioration of existing conditions by those who are willing to lend their intelligence, good sense and civic instincts to a great cause.

This book of Mr. Beers is unique. There is a considerable literature regarding "abuses" and some revengeful propaganda, written by ex-patients, ex-attendants and, occasionally, by writers of merit who saw a chance of stirring the public. But I know of none animated by a fairer spirit in the treatment of the undoubted hardships to which the author was subjected. He does not make them stand out as the one outrage or trouble in the world; he looks fairly at the situation; he takes advice as to his interpretations and recommendations. If he expresses himself more drastically than an outsider or a physician would, we can easily excuse him, for he himself had to endure the things of which he tells. He has one aim: through a knowledge of what he has experienced himself, and seen and heard, he hopes to get concerted action to improve a system too readily considered good enough as it is.

The first three parts of the book contain a vivid account of the life and experiences of the author and of the origin of his book. In the fourth part, he presents the remedies at hand today. And in an appendix he reproduces some articles by well-known authorities which are well fitted to suggest the direction in which modern practical psychiatry moves.

A reader conversant with the situation can readily see how a whole combination of circumstances conspired to create the conditions under which Mr. Beers suffered. Some of the difficulties are among those which tax us even in normal life: insufficient judgment in dealing with our fellow men. Wherever the more complex difficulty of dealing with groups of patients is handled in a summary fashion "by wards," where the individual is submerged in a compact of compromises, nothing but the utmost care will prevent real hardships. The pattern of a ward is apt to be shaped according to the demands of the patients who cause the most serious trouble—that is, the more or less chronic cases. If a ward is in such a condition as the "Bull-Pen" described in the book, the official visits are short and the chances of an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

inquiry into individual needs by the physician small and almost hopeless. These wards have existed so long that, like restraint, they are considered inevitable by those who have grown up with them. Yet we know that the great majority of the disorders seen in violent wards are artifacts, and that "violent wards" are to quite an extent the result of a crude drifting along effete lines. Unimaginative officials, uninformed of what is going on in the world, and penurious legislative censors of expenses and a misinformed public govern too many hospitals, and will continue to do so unless help is offered.

Mr. Beers looks for conscientious investigations. I doubt whether legislative investigations as urged by him can achieve the desired result. A body of experts representing the hospitals, the profession outside, economists and sociologists and men of public affairs as free as possible from fear of new responsibilities and of compromises, and appointed from time to time in every State for a comprehensive review and report of the whole status of the prevention and management of mental disorders, would serve the purpose better. But Mr. Beers also sees farther. He realizes the necessity of an organization of the public for the purpose of taking up a campaign which will bring to those who need it the warnings and suggestions which can only be obtained from a study of the actual wrecks. These are the balancing factors without which his plea would easily share the fate of the numerous outcries of the past.

There is, of course, always a danger that a book containing reports of such a serious character might inflame the imagination of a suspicious public, and foster indiscriminate distrust of the hospitals as they exist; and that, on the other hand, the hospitals which are so often harassed unreasonably by scandalmongers, from mean motives, might put on an air of perfection. Both these risks are, I trust, avoided by the frankness with which Mr. Beers describes himself as well as the conditions.

Moreover, the book comes at a more opportune time than its futile predecessors. There is a growing demand for more knowledge of mental disorders and mental difficulties among physicians, as well as a growing feeling of responsibility about mental hygiene among people generally. The book indicates some direct and concrete lines along which there must be better information, and Mr. Beers is not only willing, but anxious, to put the whole

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

task under the control of an organization which shall represent the entire movement of mental hygiene, and give the special needs a balance and proportion which they have never attained in the past.

Mr. Beers was, I think, wise to give his book as it stands without making it an exhaustive treatise on how other people should do their work. Professor William James, in the letters reproduced in the introduction, justly praises it as "fit to remain in literature as a classic account 'from within' of an insane person's psychology"; "in style, in temper, in good taste, it is irreproachable." Nobody can escape the most valuable effect of the book—that of its drawing the reader to a striking and fascinating personality, direct and sensible, and promising to become an excellent champion for a great cause. It will take many helpers and much unselfish effort to launch the attempt to solve the broad problem. May the book of Mr. Beers spread the conviction that much is to be done, but that for the most pressing difficulties help is at hand as soon as the scattered efforts shall be sufficiently co-ordinated.

Many recommendations in the book, such as those concerning commitments, correspondence, and the desirability of a National Society could hardly be brought more directly before practical readers than in connection with this most fascinatingly written human document.

ADOLPH MEYER.

THE POEMS OF W. B. YEATS.*

NEARLY every page in these two beautiful volumes brings back some early memory of my friend. When he writes:

> "Yellow the leaves of the rowan above us,
> And yellow the wet wild-strawberry leaves,"

I think of a long avenue leading up to the Dublin hills, whither we used to wander on school holidays, and where we once watched a red squirrel among the redder rowan berries. And when the Peasant in the Countess Cathleen tells how

> "people throng to sell,
> Noisy as seagulls tearing a dead fish,"

or the demon Merchant says:

* "The Poetical Works of W. B. Yeats." Vol. I, Lyrical Poems. Vol. II, Plays. New York: The Macmillan Company. London: Macmillan & Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"I can hear a sound
As from waves beating upon distant strands;
And the sea creatures, like a surf of light,
Pour eddying. . . ."

I call up the memory of a boating adventure of bygone days, when Willie Yeats and I set forth from the harbor of Howth to explore an islet where monks once lived; where, drawing up our boat incautiously among the sea-weed mantled rocks, we were left high and dry, and spent all the day and most of the night watching first the gulls, and then the rippling luminous creatures of the sea as darkness came on us. Or, again, when Cathleen tells Aleel:

"Men say that the wise people of the raths
Have given you wisdom,"

I think of a day when, exploring cromlechs and circles of Druid stones, we dug for the treasure-chamber in a rath, but did not find it; consoling ourselves with creeping into a rock-hewn Danaan chamber that overlooks the sea. So, too, such lines as these, in the Indian poems:

"O Brahma, guard in sleep
The merry lambs and the complacent kine,
The flies below the leaves, and the young mice
In the tree-roots, and all the sacred flocks
Of red flamingo,"

bring back into memory the time when we sought a pathway through the mazes of Eastern lore, gloating over the Light of Asia, the Song Celestial and the tales of the Great War. And such a passage as this:

"I, too, await
The hour of thy great wind of love and hate.
When shall the stars be blown about the sky,
Like the sparks blown out of a smithy, and die?
Surely thine hour has come, thy great wind blows,
Far off, most secret, and inviolate Rose,"

speaks of a later time, in London, when Yeats was busy with the Prophetic Books of Blake, the Kabbala and the Rosicrucianism of his friend MacGregor Mathers, with which I had less of sympathy.

Above these varied tones, Indian, Moorish, Hellenic, Norse, at last arose that clear note of Celtic melody which has carried his songs around the world. The day came when, turning

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from early Darwinian enthusiasm, Yeats began to haunt the reading-room of the Irish Academy in Dawson Street, filling his heart with old Gaelic tales and epics. The spirit of Ferguson brooded over him, guiding him through the by-paths of Erin, and presently, like returning Oisin, he came back with wonderful tales of mystic lands. In Oisin's "Wanderings" are records of his own:

"I mused on the chase with the Fenians, and Bran, Sgeolan, Lomair,
And never a song sang Niamh, and over my finger-tips
Came now the sliding of tears and sweeping of mist-cold hair,
And now the warmth of sighs, and after the quiver of lips.

"Were we days long or hours long in riding, when rolled in a grisly peace,
An isle lay level before us, with dripping hazel and oak?
And we stood on a sea's edge we saw not; for whiter than new-washed fleece
Fled foam underneath us, and round us, a wandering and milky smoke."

These songs and dramas of Erin, which have made him laureate of his land, are too well known to need quotation here. They depict an Erin mystical, ghostly, full of dreams; something that lacks the red blood of a land famous through thirty centuries of war. Take, for example, such lines as these, spoken by Dectora:

"O ancient worm,
Dragon that loved the world and held us to it,
You are broken, you are broken. The world drifts away,
And I am left alone with my beloved,
Who cannot put me from his sight forever. . . .
O flower of the branch, O bird among the leaves,
O silver fish that my two hands have taken
Out of the running stream, O morning star,
Trembling in the blue heavens like a white fawn
Upon the misty border of the wood,
Bend lower, that I may cover you with my hair,
For he will gaze upon this world no longer."

Compare with these exquisite verses an authentic passage from the Old Gaelic of the Book of Leinster, concerning the brother of the real Dectere:

"At that time Conchobar came on with nine hundred, threescore and five men to the mouth of the water of Luachann. And a house of drinking and high merriment was prepared by him in the bright-faced fortress of Delga. It was not long for Conchobar, when he was there, till he saw the bent spars of a sail and the full-crewed ships, and the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bright scarlet tents, and the beautiful, many-colored flags, and the engines of battle, and the blue bright lances, and the weapons of war. . . ."

He sings the Sorrows of Erin, yet wears his rue with a difference; having, indeed, brought into his song some of the shimmering mist of the modern romantic, the exotic color of the pre-Raphaelites, the gauze veils of Maeterlinck. I have often thought that it is not so much as the prophet of mystical Ireland that Yeats will at last stand, but rather as a master of the music of words. The modern melody of verse, which Shelley created, which Rossetti and Swinburne developed, finds in Yeats a marvellous expression. His rhythms are living, sensitive, magical; his ear for word-melody is faultless. Take lines like these:

"The wind blows out of the gates of the day,
The wind blows over the lonely of heart,
And the lonely of heart is withered away,
While the faeries dance in a place apart,
Shaking their milk-white feet in a ring,
Tossing their milk-white arms in the air;
For they hear the wind laugh and murmur and sing
Of a land where even the old are fair. . . ."

One could find no better training for the ear, no better way to gain the sense of the beauty of sound and rhythm, which fills so large a place in the best writing of all times, whether verse or prose, than the habit of reading aloud the poems in these two volumes;—such verses as those which cast their spell over Stevenson:

"I will arise and go now, for always night and day
I hear lake water lapping with low sounds by the shore. . . ."

It is a fancy of mine that Yeats was indebted, for this rhythm, to a half-conscious memory of the Prodigal: "I will arise and go to my father. . . ." For the men of Shakespeare's day, who made the King James's version of the Bible and the Book of Common Prayer, were so trained in the music of words by the great Elizabethans that they have imbedded a thousand beautiful rhythms in Scripture and Prayers alike; for example, that wonderful Invocation for the Evening: "Lighten our darkness, O Lord, we beseech Thee, and by Thy great mercy defend us!" is almost purely dactylic; and the Prayer-book is full of the same high beauty. To develop the feeling for this magical art,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to win the delight which is its gift, no better training could be imagined than a study of Yeats's verse; and I believe that he will live, not so much as a dramatist or revealer of spiritual things, as a consummate musician in words, creator of lovely rhythms and faultless melodies.

CHARLES JOHNSTON.

THE AWAKENED EAST.*

JOURNALISM must be accredited with another remarkable book of travel. Recently the world had to thank an English special correspondent, Percival Landon, for his volume on the British expedition to Lhassa; the year just begun brings to us a wholly admirable narrative of Prince Borghese's path-breaking journey from Peking, over the desolation of Mongolia, across Siberia and the Urals into Russia proper and thence, by way of St. Petersburg, to Paris. The large volume is the work of Luigi Barzini, correspondent of "*La Corriere della Sera*" of Milan and the "Daily Telegraph" of London. He gives us the latest and the best pictures of the awakened East!

Every hour of a fortnight's detention in the Chinese capital, enforced by obstacles placed in the path of the travellers by Chinese red tape, is interesting. We are veritably in Peking, dealing with the Chinaman as he is.

Justice cannot be done to Barzini's charming description of the Great Wall, one of the sublime wonders of the world, in words other than his; but space forbids. We feel the thrill of a great past when, through Barzini's eyes, we detect afar the hazy, tremulous crenelations of this tremendous work of man that shames the Pyramids at Gizeh into insignificance. On nearer approach, past temples clinging to the sides of precipices, temples in which bats are custodians and in which the sacred fire of Buddha has gone out forever, we are imbued with the awe that the writer unmistakably felt. Amid this desolation a line of telegraph-wires threads its way—an almost human friend; the only connecting-link with the newer world, of which China is almost ignorant. The Chinese people spent a thousand years in building walls against the West; "their labors were only interrupted three

* "Peking to Paris: An Account of Prince Borghese's Journey Across Two Continents in a Motor Car," by Luigi Barzini. One hundred illustrations. New York: Mitchell Kennerley.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

centuries ago, when the Chinese throne was occupied by the very Tartars against whose advent were raised these structures of bricks and mortar. To our modern mind, the Great Wall is an amazing monument to fear, huge and senseless, both magnificent and ridiculous: we admire and we deride it!" But be it remembered that in China everything is surrounded by walls,—the Empire, the cities, the temples, the houses,—for the Chinese ideal of life is tranquil captivity.

Next we find ourselves in the quaint city of Kalgan, with its sleek, pudgy, porcelain-like mandarins that are forever bobbing their heads, as if meaning "Yes," but never speaking. Before us, on the other side of the Solki range, are the verdure-covered Mongolian prairies that the awakened Chinese are colonizing with surprising activity. These abandoned farms have not been worked for centuries; but already the population is dense, and thousands of farmers have begun their migration thither from remote confines of the Empire. Travelling afoot, they cannot reach their destinations for months to come. Agriculture, a stronger invading force than an army when backed by the keen commercial sense, is driving out the nomad who cares so little for the earth that he scorns to defend it. Balked on the sea-coast by the combined self-interests of the "civilized" Powers, Chinese expansion is making for itself a landward outlet. Barzini gives to us delightful descriptions of these people. During their stay amid this teeming population the strangers were avoided at night as if they were bandits, but approached in daylight with manifestations of good-will. In two days this rural picture ends, and the real terror of the entire trip is confronted.

Before us is the Gobi Desert, into which we descend by a series of terraces. The awful fascination of the desert overtakes us! The sand is like molten lava; the Gobi is a personality, a thing to be watched that it may not come upon us in the majesty of a sand-cloud and smother us. We feel as we did when in caravan with Hichens on the Sahara, or when crouching upon a camel of Fadlalla Abdalla amid the pink waste outside the Fayoum, or rolling over Kitchiner's road across the Nubian wilderness that separates Wadi-Halfa from Abou-Hamed. But here in the Gobi we have taken leave of even rudimentary civilization; we are among counterparts of the Kirghese and the Turkomans of the Aral and Oxus, with whom MacGahan made us so well acquaint-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ed. Their line of descent from the great Mongolian trunk is clear! Confucianism has given place to Buddhism. There are shepherd Llamas at the oases; there are Llamas *fainéants* in the desert fastnesses. Meditation seems idleness to him who respects not its theme. We overtake a lone worshipper of the ever-to-be-glorified Gautama; he is bound to Urga, home of the Grand Llama since his flight from Lhassa, and has trudged, as we see him, more than a thousand miles in vague hope that he may be permitted to look upon the face of a simpering idiot boy, believed by him to be the living personification of the divine Buddha. Benares, on the Ganges, where "The Enlightened One" daily walked and talked for fifty years, is, indeed, sacred to Buddha; but far beyond the death's valley in which we wander, at Urga, dwells in visible form the successor of the first teacher who inculcated love of man for man! The pilgrim looks straight ahead. Sleeping when darkness falls, eating when he has food, fasting when he hasn't any, intent upon his search for earthly happiness in order that he may enjoy to their fulness the sweets of oblivion, he cares not for science, for Paris, for Italian princes. He is too busy wasting his life in a dream to glance at the travellers.

The only live things of the Gobi are the telegraph-poles listening to the news of the world that passes over their singing wires. At this point in his narrative Barzini excels any man of our time in imparting to his reader the mysterious, shivery silence of the desert. Temples, white as cameo in the shimmering sunlight, crown isolated peaks: mirages, they seem; but no, they are real! The inward slope of their walls is not due to the perspective effect when gazing upward at a lofty structure: here are the same pylons found at Edfu and Philæ on the Nile and that Landon photographed at the palace of the Dalai Llama in Tibet.

We cannot dwell upon the desert city of Udde. Like others in Mongolia, it is silent; its merchants barter in whispers; camels may yawn, but donkeys never bray: nowhere does one hear the boisterous, happy voices of children at play! Ah, yes; in the darkness that precedes dawn dogs do bay the moon or the ever-constant stars. How weary one grows of a sky without clouds!

Leaving this land that lived too soon for the human race, we plunge into the vast forests that encroach upon the prehistoric

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tide-line of a vanished sea that exceeded Lake Superior in size. How sociable are the trees; they are to be companions as far as the steppes of Siberia. And later, clouds appear overhead to cheer the reader like the shadow of a tender caress. He is re-entering the zone of life; it is good to be alive; when travellers do not talk they sing together. Urga! How one would like to read a whole book given up to the sacred city and its three separate, irreconcilable communities,—between Slav, Mongol and Chinese is the bulwark of age-long hatreds. Each town is several miles distant from the others; each is an intrenched camp, always on the defensive, more from tradition than present danger. Here for the first time since leaving the vicinity of Peking we encounter real money,—coin. Overshadowing the three towns is Bogda-ola, "the holy mountain," upon the crest of which is the unmarked grave of Jenghis-Khan, a conqueror who slew his enemies by millions. Nobody knows the truth about this grave, because to disturb the sleep of the demigod would be sacrilege unatonable. Like most primitive dwellers in vast plains, the peoples of this city feel veneration for lofty heights, created to bring nearer together the earth and sky.

We must say farewell to Mongolia, and we do so at Kiakhta, a twin city through which runs a green strip of sod, the frontier-line of Siberia! The town on the Mongolian side is called Maimachen, the Slav city Kiakhta; the latter has come to fetch the tea, the former to deliver it. Russia and China doing business! When one reads that Maimachen is a habitation composed of men he recalls the cruel, bitter taunt of Mme. Nazimova when she says, "Ah, yes; I came to Paris, the City of Man!"

The journey through Trans-Baikalia to Irkutsk discloses an awakened land. It is Russia, the same as on the banks of the Dnieper, the Volga or the Neva,—neither Asiatic nor European, but as different from China as it is from France. Russia enfolds writer and reader. When we hear the first whistle of a train passing along the Trans-Siberian Railway we feel that we are at home, although 5,000 miles are yet to be traversed before goal is made. The capital of Siberia, Irkutsk, Tomsk "the learned," Omsk and the Steppes, the Urals, Nijni-Novgorod, Moscow, St. Petersburg, Berlin, Paris,—all names to conjure with and Barzini has a wizard's art.

JULIUS CHAMBERS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD-POLITICS.

LONDON: ST. PETERSBURG: WASHINGTON.

LONDON, *March, 1908.*

EDUCATION and licensing are the topics, the somewhat deafening topics, of the hour. And not of the hour merely. They will continue for many weeks, possibly for many months, to engross the attention both of Parliament and of the country. It is difficult to explain to a non-English audience the intensity of passion they never fail to arouse in England. That streak of sectarian rancor and fanaticism which lies not far below the placid surface of English life and character is responsible for the unvarying heat of all debates on education; while anything that touches the drink question brings into the arena all the temperance extremists, on the one hand, and, on the other, lines up in fighting array the vast resources of one of the wealthiest and most strongly organized interests in the country. English people feel in discussing education—just as Americans felt in discussing slavery and Free Silver—that they are debating what is pre-eminently a moral issue; and nobody at this day needs to be reminded of the peculiar susceptibility of the British temperament to the moral appeal. As for the drink traffic and the problems it propounds, the fury injected into their consideration becomes partially explicable when we regard them as similar in kind to the central question which Mr. Roosevelt has raised in America—the question whether democracy or the trusts are the stronger. Both issues, therefore, are of the first order of contentiousness, and their simultaneous irruption dooms England unescapably to a period of well-nigh ferocious clamor and dissension. Both, too, are issues that have more than once overthrown Governments and that promise, not indeed to wreck, but certainly to shake, this one.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I need scarcely say that, when Englishmen engage in an educational controversy, the last subject they mention is education. An Education Bill in the British Parliament always resolves itself into a battle, not between educational "experts," but between rival sets of theologians, or, more specifically, between the Church of England, backed by the Catholics and the Jews, on the one side, and the variegated forces of Nonconformity on the other. How to reconcile the claims of these sects in the matter of educational authority and control is the essence of the problem that England is engaged in tackling. Certain broad principles may fairly be taken as governing her attitude towards it. The country, to begin with, is opposed to a purely secular system of public education. With every year that prolongs this barren feud of the sects, it is becoming less so; but at present it has no wish to banish religion from the schools. On the other hand, it is equally opposed to paying, out of public moneys, whether rates or taxes, for the teaching of one denominational creed in preference to another, and it is scarcely less willing to accept the theory that the State should provide instruction in all denominational creeds. Between furnishing equal facilities for all sects and no facilities for any sect, it has for the last seven-and-thirty years adopted a compromise. This compromise found expression in the famous Cowper-Temple clause of the Act of 1870, the Act which first gave to England the semblance of a public-school system. The effect of that clause was, roughly, to forbid denominational teaching in the public schools and to set up simple Bible instruction of a non-sectarian character. The clause, however, did not and could not apply to the voluntary schools—that is, to the schools built, endowed and owned by the Established Church. In these schools, purely Church of England doctrines continued to be taught; but, under the operation of a "conscience clause," any Nonconformist pupil was at liberty to cut the religious lessons.

Thus two broad types of schools divided the field of elementary education, (1) the public school supported from the rates and from Parliamentary grants-in-aid and expounding the fundamental truths of Christianity without any admixture of dogma, and (2) the voluntary school, supported partly by private subscriptions and partly by grants from the Government, and inculcating the doctrines of the Established Church. A child could

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

see the defects of a system under which these two types of school existed side by side, but on a different financial footing, with unequal educational standards, and with no unity either of aim or policy. What complicated the situation was that the voluntary schools drifted into a very unsatisfactory condition. Their subscription list fell off; their buildings were defective and ill equipped; and the education provided in them failed to reach even the moderate level attained by their rate-aided, publicly controlled and non-theological rivals. Yet over half the children of England are educated in these schools, and in about eight thousand areas the voluntary school is still the only school.

Two main reforms were indicated by this state of affairs. First of all, the voluntary schools had to be made efficient and they could be made efficient only by being thrown on the rates. Secondly, it was clearly essential that the disconnection between the voluntary and the public schools should cease and that both should be placed under one and the same authority empowered to regulate and harmonize their secular curricula. But the voluntary schools, as I have said, belong to the Established Church; they were founded and endowed by the piety of the members of that Church; and their trust-deeds frequently enjoined upon them the duty of teaching the doctrines of the Church and no other. They were, in short, private organizations performing public functions, partly from their own resources, but mainly with the assistance of Parliamentary subsidies. On what terms were they to be taken over by the State? If they were henceforward to be placed on the rates, if the Established Church was to be relieved of the necessity of supporting them, if they were to be made subject, like the public schools, to a popularly elected authority, what were the conditions that would most equitably govern the transaction? Should the Church retain the right of appointing the teacher? Ought the teacher in all the transferred schools to be a member of the Established Church? What facilities should be allowed for the continued teaching of Church of England doctrines? Were they to be taught as part of the regular curriculum, or out of school hours altogether? To what extent should the principle that the provision of public moneys should carry with it the right of public control be pushed, and how far might it safely be toned down to meet the special circumstances of the case?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These are but a few of the difficulties of the problem. The Act of 1902 met them or essayed to meet them in the following way. It began by making the local County or Borough Council the supreme education authority for the district, with equal power over the secular teaching in both public and voluntary schools. The voluntary schools were thrown on the rates and made a public charge, and their owners and managers were required to provide the school buildings, free of charge, for use as a public elementary school, to keep them in repair, and to make reasonable alterations and improvements if required. On the other hand, they retained the right of teaching their own doctrines in the schools; no teacher appointed or dismissed by them could be discharged or reinstated by the local education authority except on purely educational grounds; and in the management of the voluntary schools four directors were to be appointed by the local churchmen and two by the local education authority. Against these provisions the Nonconformists strongly protested, carrying their protest so far as to organize a movement of passive resistance and going to prison rather than pay the new education rate. The grounds of their protest were that the rates were being used to support a denominational creed; that, while the people were finding the money for the maintenance of the voluntary schools, they had only a very partial and incomplete control over them; and that the Act practically excluded qualified teachers from the majority of the schools because they were not members of the Established Church.

The Act of 1902 played a very great part in the election of 1906. The Liberals were returned to power with a clear mandate to amend it. The result was Mr. Birrell's ill-fated Bill. Mr. Birrell brought the voluntary schools under the full and entire control of the local education authority. The teachers were to be free from any and every kind of religious test. The religious instruction to be given by them was to be purely undenominational—the "simple Bible teaching" which has obtained in all the public schools since 1870, and which the Church has not objected to until now; but on two mornings in the week, out of school hours, at their own expense and through the medium of specially imported teachers, the owners of any voluntary school might provide religious instruction according to their own creed for such as cared to receive it. Where the parents of four-fifths

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the children desired it, a school in an urban area might still continue to exist as a denominational school, and the teachers employed in the school might dispense the religious instruction required, but not at the public expense. The local education authority was to lease the schools from their present owners, paying rent for their use on five days in the week from nine in the morning till four in the afternoon, and bearing all the cost of maintaining the buildings, but leaving the present owners in exclusive possession of them during the whole of Saturday and Sunday, and on week-day evenings. Such was the main outline of Mr. Birrell's measure. The commonest criticism passed on its provisions was that they remedied an injustice against the Nonconformists by creating one against the Church. That was the view taken by the Lords. In a succession of amendments, they vitiated the principles and destroyed the purpose of the Bill, and sought apparently to reimpose upon the country a system even more favorable to the Established Church than was the Act of 1902. The Government refused to accept the amendments; the Lords refused to withdraw them; and the Bill was lost.

And now comes Mr. Birrell's successor, Mr. McKenna, with another solution. It follows Mr. Birrell's in its main principles. That is to say, the public, where it provides the funds, is to manage the schools and to appoint the teachers. The latter are to be free from all religious tests. The religious instruction permitted in the schools at the public expense is to be "simple Bible teaching." A school of this type is to be considered the standing model of elementary educational establishments in England, and it is only to a school of this type that children will be compelled to go. That is to say, in areas where the only school is a voluntary school, Nonconformist parents will not be punished by the law, as they are at present, for failing to enforce their children's attendance. The Bill, however, does everything it can to reduce such cases to a minimum. It provides that, in the present single-school areas where only a voluntary school exists, that school, if it wishes to receive the Parliamentary grant and rate-aid, must be transferred to the local authority. On the off-school days (Saturday and Sunday), and on other days out of school hours, Church teaching may be given if the parents desire it, but it must not be given either at the public expense or by the regular school teacher. In larger areas, where a choice of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

schools exists, the voluntary schools are allowed an option. They may, if they like, continue exactly as they are, privately managed, appointing their own teachers, maintaining their own doctrinal atmosphere; but, in that case, they will not receive any aid from the rates, and they will only receive a Parliamentary grant on condition that they reach a certain standard of size and efficiency, and are not carried on for private profit. If, on the other hand, the voluntary schools in the larger areas decide, as it is most desirable that they should, to come within the four corners of the national system, and to submit to public control, then they will continue to receive both rate-aid and the Parliamentary grant, they will be provided with facilities for denominational teaching on Saturdays and Sundays, their present teachers will continue in office, and the school buildings will be furnished, warmed, cleaned and lighted at the sole expense of the education authority, which, however, is to pay no rent for them. I should add that the Parliamentary grant, above referred to, is to be largely increased, and though not sufficient in itself to maintain the efficiency of any voluntary school that elects to forego rate-aid for the sake of remaining a purely denominational institution, it will only need to be supplemented by a very small donation from the pockets of private sympathizers.

If the Bill becomes law, there will, therefore, still remain three types of public elementary schools in England: (1) the ordinary type, over which the public control will be absolute and in which no distinctive catechism or formulary will be taught; (2) the public schools which will furnish special facilities, not at the public expense, for denominational teaching; (3) voluntary schools that have "contracted out" of the Bill, have chosen to do without aid from the rates, and that so long as they are educationally efficient will be permitted to manage themselves in their own way by the combined help of a Parliamentary grant and private subscriptions. The first two types will be both rate-aided and grant-aided; the third will receive the Parliamentary grant only. This is, of course, from the strictly educational standpoint, a very unsatisfactory and complicated arrangement, but it is probably the best, or nearly the best, that the conditions of England permit. I have gone into the matter at length partly because to have it thus set before them in some detail may lead Americans to realize anew how much they owe

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the good sense that has enabled them to preserve the cause of education from being made the victim of a barren sectarianism. I dare not prophesy the fate of Mr. McKenna's Bill. Some of the Nonconformists denounce it as too liberal to the Church, while the Church itself professes to stand aghast at the stringency and unfairness of its provisions. I see no signs that it will succeed in conciliating those whom Mr. Birrell's Bill of two years ago drove into revolt. On the right of the public teacher (a right denied to him by the Bill) to give denominational teaching out of school hours, if he so pleases, a fierce battle is certain to be joined; and the Church will probably endeavor to extract some guarantee that the teachers appointed by the local education authority will be qualified to give religious instruction. The financial arrangements and the nature and extent of the facilities to be granted to the Church will also come in for sharp criticism. Altogether I can conceive the defeat of Mr. McKenna's Bill as something quite within the bounds of possibility. And there are many Englishmen who, zealous for education and wholly repelled by these endless theological squabbles, would welcome its defeat as bringing the secular solution they desire a long step nearer.

ST. PETERSBURG, *March, 1908.*

WHAT Russia needs most of all is to be purified. For it matters little whether the Government is constitutional or autocratic, if the wrongs under which the population has been suffering for ages continue unchecked. And this contingency appears highly probable. Take, as a symptom, the trial of General Stoessel and three of his comrades for surrendering Port Arthur. The court, people hoped, would lay bare the wounds of the Russian army with a view to their treatment and cure. But the judges, shrinking from the task, confined their attention to the charges against the four distinguished prisoners, upon one of whom, General Stoessel, they formally pronounced sentence of death, which will doubtless be commuted into confinement in a fortress for ten years. Although the tribunal rigidly eliminated all evidence as to the condition of Port Arthur when the war broke out, or the part played by the navy there, it casually let in a few rays of light on the hidden causes of Russia's defeat by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Japan. And one of these causes was, undoubtedly, the well-meant, but unwarranted, interference of the Crown in the plans of the commander-in-chief.

It is certain that General Kuropatkin made a series of fatal blunders. And it is equally true that Russia was quite unprepared for offence or defence against Japan. But, when every allowance has been made for these factors, there still remains one other important cause of defeat—the interference with Kuropatkin's plans practised by the Crown. The Tsar appointed Admiral Alexeyeff generalissimo of the land and sea forces. Alexeyeff resolved not to yield one rood of soil to the enemy, and therefore to try issues with him in the south. Kuropatkin's plan of campaign, devised for the north, was very different, but he could not carry it out because he was placed under Alexeyeff. What he would have done, had he been a free agent, was to leave Port Arthur to do what it could, to withdraw the troops from the south to Harbin, to entrench himself firmly there, and then to await the Japanese onset.

Here is an interesting episode which throws light on the matter, and has never yet been published. On the eve of his departure for the seat of war, Kuropatkin called upon Witté and unfolded his plan of campaign. "How does it seem to you?" he inquired, when he had finished the sketch. "It seems the only scheme likely to prove successful," was the answer. "Now, I want you to give me a piece of sound advice," Kuropatkin went on. "You know my difficult position. What, in your opinion, should I do on arriving in Mukden?" "But I am not a strategist; how can you expect me to advise you?" "You know the country, the conditions and much else. So speak out." "Well, if you insist, I comply. Instead of saying what you ought to do, I will tell you how in your place I would act. You are going off amid the sound of pæans. Your future successes are being discounted by the nation. No man in the Empire can vie with you in popularity to-day, and popularity is latent power. You, therefore, can do what many would not dare. Very well; I in your place would wield that power. On my arrival at Mukden, I would say to my aide-de-camp: 'Go to Alexeyeff at once. Arrest him and bring him to me.' And when Alexeyeff was thus conveyed, I should say to him: 'Your presence here is pernicious. You must quit the theatre of war without a moment's delay.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I am sending you to St. Petersburg in my own special train. Good-by.' I should then forward a telegram to the Emperor, saying: 'May it please your Majesty: Deeming it my duty to arrest Alexeyeff in the interests of the Empire, I am sending him to St. Petersburg. If your Majesty condemns my action, I humbly pray that I may be shot. If, on the contrary, the step I have taken has your Majesty's approval, I will return from the theatre of war only after the conclusion of an honorable peace.'" At this Kuropatkin laughed heartily, and exclaimed, "Ah, you are in a facetious mood." "But I am not. I assure you, I am not. What I have said I mean. I am most serious."

Kuropatkin went to the south against his will and contrary to his better judgment and original intention. And during the campaign he often said to those who were intimate with him: "I have a war to wage with two fronts: in the south with Oyama, and in the north with Alexeyeff." If Kuropatkin had arrested Alexeyeff at Mukden he would have had no battles in the south. Port Arthur, no doubt, would have fallen; but the upshot of the war would probably have been very different from what it was.

At Stoessel's trial a telegram was divulged which the Tsar sent to Alexeyeff during the war. It enabled one to guess what Kuropatkin meant by his war with Alexeyeff. Here is an English translation of it: "Mukden. To Adjutant-General Alexeyeff. The fate of Port Arthur is arousing grave apprehensions; therefore, I consider it absolutely indispensable that most decisive measures be adopted to draw away from it the onset of the Japanese troops. I refrain from indicating the methods, the direction or the means of rendering assistance to Port Arthur, because I leave that to the discretion of the person who is invested with the full powers of commander-in-chief. I do, however, consider that the question of the Manchurian army proceeding to action has, thanks to the conditions which have arisen, become perfectly mature, inasmuch as one of the results of further waiting for reinforcements may be that the rainy season will come upon us while we are still waiting, and Port Arthur will receive no succor from the army. Tell Kuropatkin that I make him entirely responsible for the fate of Port Arthur. Nicholas."

The trial of General Stoessel and his three comrades was hardly over when that of another set of state prisoners began, whose existence is a permanent *memento mori* to the Imperial family

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and to the most prominent members of the Government. The individuals in question are members of the "revolutionary flying column," whose object is to slay the Grand Duke Nicholas, the Premier, if possible the Tsar, and generally to strike terror among the rulers of the Empire. During the past few months a desperate game of mine and countermine has been played between the police and the would-be regicides, under fanciful conditions, and with dramatic incidents which would bring grist to the mill of a sensational novelist. Espionage of a most complicated sort is frequent—the terrorist spy entering the police service the better to help his comrades, then betraying them to the authorities, and, finally, to redeem his life, returning to his former friends with information about the designs of their pursuers. Then there are the comedies of errors that arise from the dressing up of terrorists as police officers and the appearance of detectives as terrorists, and the confusing action of the common police, some of whom were on the side of the terrorists, but mistook them for their enemies.

As the members of the Imperial family are, happily, beyond the reach of the assassin's bomb and bullet, personages of lesser importance have been singled out as victims, and foremost among them Premier Stolypin and the Grand Duke Nicolai Nicolayevich, who commands the troops of the St. Petersburg Military District, and is the only Grand Duke who is still believed to wield a certain degree of influence over the Emperor. Several attempts on his life have already been frustrated, mostly by chance. A few days ago a new, elaborate plot was hatched, the deadliest of weapons were chosen, an unusually large number of conspirators volunteered to do the work, for safety's sake the headquarters of the plotters were removed to Finland, and, in order to make assurance doubly sure, an officer of the gendarmes was won over to co-operate. Everything went smoothly up to a certain point.

The gendarme officer, Bogdanoff, was arrested first. And there was no doubt that he was thoroughly a convert to terrorism, for he carried a bomb on his person which was the most destructive yet used in the revolution. The arrest of another individual in Finland led to the discovery of the head office of the gang, where most important papers were seized. Everything else followed as a matter of course. On February 20th the plot against

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Grand Duke and the Minister of Justice was to have been executed. Two hundred detectives, aware of the design, were ready to thwart it. Some dressed as common sleigh-drivers took up their positions hard by the Grand Duke's palace in the centre of St. Petersburg. Others were disguised as harmless peasants or laborers. All were watchful and all were well armed. From the house adjoining the palace a well-dressed young woman issued forth, together with a man. Seeing the agents approach her, the lady scampered off, levelling a revolver and shooting at large as she retreated. Having missed her pursuers, she turned the weapon against herself, missed again and was captured. In her muff she was carrying twelve pounds of dynamite. Her male companion, who was also taken, wore a belt round his waist and in it an infernal machine charged with five pounds of dynamite.

Not far from the Grand Duke's palace, another girl of seventeen, bright and comely, was also arrested and led to the station by two agents, each holding one of her hands. At the station, one of her captors let go of a hand in order to open the door. The girl pulled out a revolver and in a twinkling sent a bullet through the man's skull. Sixty persons in all were arrested, but only about twenty were charged with complicity in the plot.

This nefarious plot, then, has also been balked like so many others. But how long will the advantage in the game of mine and countermine remain on the side of the feeble police? Many of the leaders of the gang have escaped; and this is but one of several secret bands which are plotting, preparing and biding their time. And that is an inexhaustible source of possible mischief to the Russian Empire. For these revolutionists fear nothing. The State is powerless to intimidate them. They themselves have no horror of death, even in the most appalling shapes. They court it. They are eager to blow themselves up if they can slay their victim thereby. One of them, who was confined in Yalta prison, gave a gruesome proof of this a few days ago. He burned himself to death under conditions which seem almost incredible. He had but a little petroleum—hardly enough for his fell purpose. Pouring it over the breast and back of his garment, he set fire to it, suffered agonies in silence. When the warders entered they found a half-charred corpse. A band of such fanatics leagued against an individual, a family or a corporate body is in truth a formidable danger.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WASHINGTON, *March, 1908.*

IT would be hard to exaggerate the depth of the impression made on the representatives of foreign Powers in Washington by the arrival of our battleship fleet in Magdalena Bay ahead of scheduled time and in a more efficient condition than it exhibited when it left Hampton Roads. A more startling contrast to the series of mishaps lately suffered by French war-ships, or to the dismal experience of the great fleet despatched by Russia to Eastern Asia under Rojestvensky could hardly be conceived. Admiral Evans has demonstrated the feasibility of taking an American Armada around South America within a time specified beforehand, and of bringing it to the waters of the North Pacific in a state fit for immediate fighting. To appreciate the effect of this achievement on the professional mind, we need but ask ourselves what would have been thought of the American Navy if the progress of the fleet had been interrupted by long delays, or if it had been attended with the loss or grave injury of any of the battleships.

Now that we have proved what we can do, the chances of our being called upon in the immediate future to show the magnitude of our sea power in the Pacific have sensibly diminished, if they have not vanished.

The decision reached by our Government that the battleship fleet, on its homeward voyage shall stop at Melbourne and Sydney, may have in the end important consequences. Of all Britain's colonies, Australia and New Zealand have begun to feel themselves not only the most exposed to aggression, but also the least protected by the Mother Country. England has never had in the Pacific a fleet for a moment comparable to that which within the year will fly the Stars and Stripes in Australian waters. Not only is this true, but in view of the necessity of maintaining strong naval forces in the North Sea, the British Channel and the Mediterranean, the British Government never can afford to send for the defence of Australia so many battleships as we have now assembled in the Pacific. How can the visit of the American Armada fail to plant in the Australian heart a feeling that hereafter she should look for a champion, not to Britain, but to the United States? What is true of Australia and New Zealand will be true also of the British West Indies after the completion of the Panama Canal. Those islands will

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be impelled by a force as strong as that of gravitation to union with the great North-American Republic.

Well-informed persons here believe that, when the secret diplomatic history of the last year is divulged, it will be found that the present friendly relations of Japan and the United States and the satisfactory settlement of the Japanese emigration question are due largely, if not mainly, to the influence quietly exerted by the British Government through its representative in Tokio, or through the Japanese Ambassador in London. It is impossible to overrate the extent of that influence, for the alliance with Great Britain, concluded on August 12th, 1905, is indispensable to Japan. Had she possessed that alliance in 1895, the war with Russia would not have occurred, for she would not have been deprived by a Russo-Franco-German combination of the ascendancy in Korea and Southern Manchuria, together with the lease of the Liao-tung peninsula which constituted parts of the fruit of her victory over China. One obvious reason for the Tsar's feverish anxiety to hasten the reconstruction of the Russian Navy is the knowledge that the Anglo-Japanese alliance, if not previously renewed, expires by limitation in 1915, and that if, thereafter, Great Britain should hold herself aloof, as she did in 1895, a new coalition of Germany, France and Russia might succeed in annihilating Japan's sea power and wresting from her a second time her acquisitions on the Asiatic mainland. In view of all the circumstances, past, actual and prospective, the influence of the British Government must be irresistible at Tokio, and we have but little doubt that it was exerted promptly and energetically to avert a collision between Japan and the United States, the principal purveyors of food and cotton to the British people.

Although, at the hour when we write, it is still problematical whether Mr. Roosevelt will send another Special Message to Congress repeating in a condensed form the recommendations embodied in his Message of January 31st, there is no doubt that he will try in one way or another to bring about the enactment of certain legislation at this session. He wants, for instance, to see the adoption of a new Employer's Liability Bill, modified so as to meet the objection made to the former law by the United States Supreme Court on the score of constitutionality. This particular wish seems likely to be gratified, and so may be his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

desire to have the anti-trust law amended so as to permit railroad corporations to enter into pooling arrangements subject to the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission and to acquire connecting lines. We may, on the other hand, affirm with confidence that Congress at this session will not consent to amend the law so as to exempt labor unions from the provisions concerning combinations in restraint of trade. The proposal is too barefaced a bid for the labor vote. It is also improbable that the Erdman Law for the adjustment of disputes between labor and capital will be re-enacted in such a way as to eliminate the part which was pronounced unconstitutional by the United States Supreme Court. The leaders of Congress wish to adjourn by the middle of May, in order to co-operate actively in the Presidential campaign.

That the Aldrich Bill will become a law seems likely enough, now that it has been amended, so as to exclude railroad bonds from the basis of emergency circulation, and also so as to limit the issue of such circulation to the par value of the securities deposited, no matter how much above par the securities may be selling for on the New York Stock Exchange. Another amendment accepted by Mr. Aldrich provides that the limit of circulation to be retired by the national banks in any one month shall not exceed nine million dollars. Senator La Follette, who is an assailant of the Currency Bill, afforded financiers some amusement on March 17th by his heated altercation with Senator Aldrich. He charged that the national banks of New York City were behind the bill, to which Mr. Aldrich replied that, as a matter of fact, all the national banks in New York City are opposed to it. He had, he said, a letter from the New York Clearing House which declared that it would be better to have no bill at all than the pending measure. He also asserted that Vice-President Vanderlip, of the National City Bank, had written to him in opposition to the proposed currency measure. It is doubtful whether Mr. La Follette can influence the vote of a single Republican Senator except himself. In the House of Representatives, on the other hand, the bill is likely to encounter considerable resistance, but there is an agreement of opinion that in the end it will be passed. Undoubtedly the President will sign it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE EDITOR'S DIARY,

The Political Situation.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT shows no sign of weakening in his determination to effect the nomination of Secretary Taft as his successor, and the worthy Secretary himself is prosecuting the quest with characteristic assiduity. How much actual progress he has made is not apparent, because of the autocratic authority held by political bosses in so many States. His triumph over Senator Foraker in Ohio seems to be definite and conclusive, but this was to have been expected from the day when Boss Cox rallied to his standard. That he could have made an excellent showing against Governor Hughes in New York, moreover, there can be no doubt, had he not considered it the part of wisdom to avert a serious party disruption. So, too, in Indiana, Illinois and Pennsylvania, President Roosevelt's popularity and the great influence of the Federal officeholders could easily have been utilized to divide the delegations with the "favorite sons." But it is not in Mr. Taft's nature, and apparently not within the scope of the President's policy, to create antagonisms which might prove to have been both hurtful and unnecessary. So the candidate pursues the even tenor of his way, guardedly upholding the administration on all occasions, and winning distinct favor on his own account whenever he comes into personal contact with the people. But for the stealthy and resolute opposition of powerful conservative Republicans, his nomination and, in our judgment, his election would be assured.

That opposition, however, must be reckoned with. It is much stronger and far more bitter than is generally supposed, and finds its home in the hearts of men accustomed to dominate, without whose active aid no Republican has ever been elected President. The reasons for the frank antagonism of this powerful group are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

well known. Those comprising it—capitalists, bankers, manufacturers and business men generally—would have welcomed the nomination of Mr. Taft two years ago; his judicial temperament and his record, especially with respect to labor-unions, were wholly to their liking; and his engaging personality would have been recognized as a most useful factor in maintaining the dominance of the Republican party without the need of making the enormous expenditures which in recent campaigns have been deemed essential to the accomplishment of that purpose.

Hostility was engendered primarily by the fact that he was the President's candidate, whose success could be regarded as second only to Mr. Roosevelt's own re-election as evidence of approval of a radical departure in executive administration which is considered to be pregnant with danger to stability in government. Even so, this apprehension might have been allayed had not Mr. Taft voluntarily or under pressure from his chief declared his personal adherence to nearly, if not quite, all of the so-called "policies" which have come to be regarded as highly objectionable. But two alternative conclusions could be reached by the conservatives: Either Mr. Taft had been really converted to the new ways by the persuasive President, or he was ready and willing to forswear his own convictions to gratify his personal ambition. In either case he could not be regarded as trustworthy or likely to prove a satisfactory Chief Magistrate, especially at a time when calmness and caution are believed to be the most requisite of qualifications.

There is no gainsaying the logic of this conclusion from the point of view indicated; but, to our mind, it is fatally defective in that it gives no heed to attendant circumstances and closely related conditions of vital importance. Whatever may have instigated the present popular trend towards radicalism, there can be no question that it exists in an aggravated form, and that in the eyes of the masses it has but two dependable exponents. This fact, indeed, is so well recognized by both President Roosevelt and Mr. Bryan that each takes particular care to avert possible loss of his own popularity by complimenting the other whenever opportunity offers. The two being the undoubted leaders of their respective parties, and there being practically no differences in policy between them, except in so far as "regulation" differs from "ownership" of railways, it is plain that a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wholly unprecedented situation has arisen in American politics; and that an attempt to resolve it by appealing to party sentiment or by purchasing votes, as in the past, would be hopelessly futile.

We do not take seriously the implied threats which emanate at intervals from the White House to the effect that the conservatives must accept the President's nominee or abide by his own renomination; we regard that as no more than a thoroughly characteristic and somewhat amusing play in the interesting game. Mr. Roosevelt proposes to have his own way in naming his successor or know the reason why, but he has no intention of becoming the candidate himself. It may be, although we cannot so believe, that he might not consider his voluntary pledge of restraint an insurmountable barrier to recognition of so great a popular demand, let us say, as would be evidenced by nominations by both political conventions; but the breaking of his given word under any less importunate call is hardly conceivable.

Even though the people should show in some such manner virtual unanimity in insisting that the President continue the work of moral regeneration of whose beginning he is naturally proud, we are assured upon the highest authority that he would flatly refuse to comply with the demand. Contrary to an opinion which has become quite general, the President cherishes no illusions respecting his own character or temperament. He appreciates the irresistibility of his impulse to seize and exercise to the fullest extent the greatest measure of power attainable, and, being alive to the danger to the Republic of further absorption, he reluctantly, we may well believe, but firmly and patriotically, renounces an extension of authority which might lead to kingship or revolution. While all will not concur in the President's opinion that he would be reelected by an overwhelming majority, there is no doubt of the sincerity of his own belief to that effect. His present attitude, therefore, must be regarded by friends and foes alike as highly commendable, and comparable in our history only with the act of George Washington in rejecting the proffer of a crown.

The Republican situation, then, is resolved to a choice between Secretary Taft and one of the more conservative candidates, and the question of availability immediately arises. The most pertinent query, Could any candidate except Mr. Taft poll the full "Roosevelt vote"? must be answered in the negative. That Mr.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Roosevelt personally would loyally support the candidacy of Speaker Cannon, Governor Hughes or even Mr. Fairbanks may be taken for granted, but the like could not be said with confidence of the multitude of followers. The fact that a nomination had been made in flat contravention of the President's strong desire would act as a deterrent even more effectively than the precisely similar feeling whose manifestation among Mr. Bryan's adherents resulted in the crushing defeat of Mr. Parker in 1904. There can be no reasonable doubt that Mr. Roosevelt's enthusiastic championship of his own candidate would hold his radical supporters for Mr. Taft; but it is by no means certain that the nomination of another would not open wide the door to Mr. Bryan to pose successfully as the President's real legatee, and draw from the Republican ranks hundreds of thousands of resentful radicals. To our mind, at any rate, in a time of hardship which will be greatly intensified before November such a result seems not only possible, but highly probable.

Moreover, the fact should not be overlooked that the nomination of an anti-Roosevelt candidate by the Republicans would leave to conservative Democrats little argument against Mr. Bryan at Denver. The present growing feeling of certainty that Mr. Bryan could not possibly win against Mr. Roosevelt or Mr. Taft is weakening his candidacy daily, and may yet encompass his defeat in the Democratic convention; but what answer likely to prove convincing to the delegates could be made to the query, Who can poll as many votes as Bryan against Fairbanks, Cannon or even Hughes? In the event of Mr. Taft's nomination with substantial unanimity, we should not be surprised to see Mr. Bryan voluntarily withdraw in the interest of the party to which he is so greatly indebted; but if he should be blessed with the privilege of opposing another, nothing could prevent his nomination by acclamation, and grave doubts respecting the ultimate result would exist till the ballots had been cast and counted. In any case, the period of unrest, uncertainty and business depression would surely continue.

In view of these considerations, and of certain positive arguments that may properly be advanced in favor of Mr. Taft,—such as his record on the bench, in the Philippines and in the cabinet, his undoubted personal fitness, his recognized intellectual, judicial and moral equipment, his tact, popularity and sweetness

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and humor of disposition,—the present antagonistic attitude of the group of Republican conservatives to whom we have referred impresses us as short-sighted and unwise, if not, indeed, unpatriotic. Surely mere pique at the President for insisting upon naming his successor and a desire to humiliate him cannot be held to justify conduct almost certain to bring yet further distress to our harassed land. Nor is there any real ground for the suspicion that Mr. Taft as President would represent anybody but Mr. Taft himself and the whole American people. His guarded expressions of approval of Mr. Roosevelt's medley of "policies" are insignificant when contrasted with his firm declaration that, now that the President's moral crusade has been crowned with general adoption of better business methods, the time has come to refrain from enacting further coercive legislation, and to open wide again the door to American enterprise and progress.

For ourselves, we cannot but feel that these practical considerations greatly outweigh any proper feeling of resentment at the President's autocratic insistence, and that it is the part of wisdom for all good citizens to acquiesce in the nomination of Mr. Taft as not only excellent in itself, but likely to effect a suitable Democratic nomination as well, and thus permit the immediate restoration of confidence which has become so vitally essential to the well-being of the whole people.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED